

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2009

Man Up Or Punk Out: The Role Of Masculinity In Prison Rape

Melanie Carlson
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Doctoral Dissertation (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

Carlson, Melanie, "Man Up Or Punk Out: The Role Of Masculinity In Prison Rape" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019*. 3961.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/3961>



MAN UP OR PUNK OUT: THE ROLE OF MASCULINITY IN PRISON RAPE

by

MELANIE CARLSON

B.A. California State University, Chico, 2003

M.A. California State University, Chico, 2005

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Summer Term
2009

Major Professor: Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine

ABSTRACT

Using the dataset, “Ethno-Methodological Study of the Subculture of Prison Inmate Sexuality in the United States, 2004-2005,” this study investigated the relationship between masculinities and prison rape. These data was collected in 23 men’s correctional institutions in 10 states. Between April 2004 and September 2005, 409 males were interviewed (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

Findings showed that masculinity plays a complex and crucial role in the phenomenon of prison rape. Recommendations were made for inmate-oriented education and training which should include a discussion of masculinity as a possible preventative measure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I must thank the inmates who participated in this study, without them these data would be non-existent.

I am extraordinarily grateful to Elizabeth Ehrhardt Mustaine, Elizabeth Grauerholz, Tracy Dietz, and Eileen Able for graciously agreeing to serve on my committee and giving me the benefit of their experience, knowledge, and thoughts. The phrase thank you is not enough.

I also owe a huge debt of gratitude to Ida Cook, fellow cat-lover and all-around wise woman.

To the members of the first and second doctoral cohorts, it was my privilege and my grace to have endured the special experience of graduate school with all of you. In particular, I am forever lucky to have had some very special moments with Monica Mendez, Rebecca Weichsel, Megan Duesterhaus, Dolores Edelen, Deb Barr, Nick Libby, Erin Nabors, Drew Freeland, Christian Bolden, Minna Laurikkala, and Rae Taylor. I must also acknowledge what a great experience it has been to have gotten to know Betsy Swart, Scott Larson, Jennifer Reed, and Tim Colyer. To know all of you has been such a gift.

Kathy Kaiser my mentor from the CSU system for her time, energy, and unfailing support of me in my pursuit of higher education. Thank you so much, Kathy.

My tante Carolyn, I am truly blessed to have had you in my life all these years and after so much has happened.

My two best friends on earth: Brian Hill and Crystal Garrison, what a great gift it has been for us to make this journey of life together.

There is no one that I need to thank and acknowledge more than my husband Sean Carlson. His unyielding support and unconditional love makes me a better person.

Lastly, my mom who I love and miss a great deal. *Shalom aleikhem mame. Ich liebe dich.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | VIII |
| CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW | 4 |
| How Much Prison Rape Is There? | 5 |
| Use of Multiple Definitions and Operationalizations..... | 6 |
| Methods of Data Collection | 10 |
| Under Reporting of Prison Rape | 12 |
| Factors Associated With Prison Sexual Victimization..... | 13 |
| Race and Ethnicity | 13 |
| Sexual Orientation | 14 |
| Physical Size | 15 |
| Prison Roles | 15 |
| Sex Offenders..... | 15 |
| Consequences of Prison Rape | 16 |
| Medical Trauma | 16 |
| Emotional Trauma | 17 |
| Rehabilitation Disruption..... | 18 |
| CHAPTER THREE: FLEISHER AND KRIENERT RESEARCH STUDY | 20 |
| The Main Findings | 21 |
| CHAPTER FOUR: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK | 32 |
| Masculinity Theory | 32 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Masculinities and Rape | 40 |
| Male Rape and Masculinity..... | 42 |
| Masculinities and Prison Culture | 43 |
| Male Prison Rape and Masculinity | 45 |
| Strengths and Weaknesses of Masculinity Theory..... | 50 |
| CHAPTER FIVE: THE PRESENT STUDY | 53 |
| Methods | 54 |
| Data and Sample | 54 |
| Participants..... | 57 |
| Coding and Data Analysis Strategy..... | 58 |
| Issues with Secondary Qualitative Data Analysis | 63 |
| CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS | 66 |
| Be a Man or Be a Victim..... | 66 |
| Weak and Soft | 70 |
| Young, Small, White and/or Pretty | 71 |
| The Role of Race | 73 |
| Other Prisoner's Views on Effeminate Inmates | 75 |
| Homosexuals Have Power..... | 77 |
| Became a Bitch, Fag, or Woman as a Result of Rape..... | 79 |
| Victims Becoming Men Again..... | 85 |
| They Wanted It/Allowed It/Really Are Gay | 87 |
| Reporting Rape..... | 90 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Reporting Rape is Snitching | 90 |
| Transfer/PC Not Safe | 91 |
| Rape Because Need Sex | 93 |
| Rapists are Powerful..... | 96 |
| They Rape Because They are Gay | 97 |
| They are Hated | 98 |
| Boxing Betty..... | 98 |
| CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION | 101 |
| The Importance of Using Violence to Retain Masculinity..... | 101 |
| Retaliation and Consequences..... | 106 |
| Implications | 107 |
| Farmer versus Brennan and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) | 108 |
| Benefits..... | 111 |
| Limitations..... | 111 |
| APPENDIX: DEMOGRAPHICS | 113 |
| REFERENCES | 122 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Theoretical Themes and Frequency Inmates Mentioned Them | 67 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

One of the many risks associated with imprisonment is prison rape. This is particularly the case in men's prisons. The true rate of male prison rape is unknown, but what is known is that prisoners fear rape, and know about rapes that have occurred (Fleischer & Krienert, 2006), thus, prison rape is an important issue worthy of study. The problem of prison rape traumatizes its victims, creates and exacerbates the climate of fear in the nation's prisons, and contributes to the spread of HIV/AIDS in prisons and potentially, the general population (Bureau of Justice Statistics [BJS], 2006). Further, the broader implications of prison rape are also significant and worthy of discussion. Such issues to consider are prisoner rehabilitation and lifelong medical problems for those who are most likely lacking in opportunities for good medical care and adequate health insurance.

Sexual assault is a serious problem in the nation's prisons. However, additionally, estimates vary as to the actual rate of victimization. Research has indicated that rates of rape vary from as low as one percent of inmates being sexually assaulted to as high as 41 percent (Wolff, Blitz, Shi, Bachman, & Siegel, 2006). The exact extent of prison rape is unknown. However, the general consensus seems to be that prison rape is a contributing factor to prison violence as a whole (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2000). For example, prison rape victims are often pressured into violently retaliating against their attackers. Rape is a form of prison violence which is rampant but is also a symbol of the gendered nature of the prison.

Prisons are gendered institutions (Sabo, Kupers, & London, 2001). In mainstream society, the gender order consists of two main paradigms: a hierarchal system in which men are dominant over women and another hierarchal system in which higher-status men dominate over other men, particularly those men who have lower statuses (Connell, 1995). These two processes mirror and support one another and violence is one way in which status is attained, maintained and re-attained (Connell, 1995). This relationship is reciprocal, as this ever-present threat of violence also shapes expectations of male behavior and what masculinity means to men and women. The idea of men using violence to maintain their dominant positions is most often seen in situations of domestic violence (Johnson, 2008), however, violence between those who are acquainted in some way also occurs outside the home (Sanday, 1996). It is likely this system of masculine power being retained via the use of violence is present in such a highly male environment as the prison. It is also probable that this dominant male system contributes to the problem of prison rape.

The present study seeks to address these relationships between masculinity, violence, and prison rape as well as add to the current literature on male prison rape using the qualitative data set, "Ethnographic Methodological Study of the Subculture of Prison Inmate Sexuality in The United States, 2004-2005," collected by Fleischer and Krienert, (2006). The current study will investigate a number of factors regarding what contributes to the problem of male prison rape, what inmates think about it and those who perpetrate and are victims of it, and how male inmates are affected by it. Of specific interest for this study is how expectations of masculinity emerge and flourish in prison and how this and

all its encompassing issues shape and contribute to the problem of prison rape within the male prison system.

Following the introduction, Chapter Two is a comprehensive literature review on the topic of prison rape and masculinity. Chapter Three examines the original research done by Fleisher and Krienert (2006). Chapter Four examines the theory of masculinity and how it contributes to and explains the problem of prison rape. Chapter Five covers the methods employed and describes the sample used for this study. Chapter Five also discusses the issues that arise when analyzing qualitative data secondarily. Chapter Six presents the research findings. Chapter Seven examines the benefits, limitations, and contributions of this study. Lastly, Chapter Eight summarizes the findings and provides a discussion and a conclusion to this research. Next, I turn to an examination of the previous literature on the topics of prison rape, masculinity, and the relationship between them.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Violence in prison, particularly prison rape (PR), is a serious problem among the incarcerated population of the United States. However, it is not the only form of violence in prison. Though the vast majority of inmates die from illness (not including AIDS), in a five year period from 2001-2006, 1,172 inmates in state custody died from suicide, and another 299 were the victims of homicide (BJS, 2007a). What is compelling about these data is that violent offenders are nearly always the victims of both of these crimes (Mumola, 2005). Indeed, 67 percent of murder victims in custody were convicted of a violent offense and these offenders are more than twice as likely to commit suicide as non-violent offenders (Mumola, 2005). Suicides and homicides have high reporting rates; however, findings about rates of these forms of violence in prison are readily available. Assault in prison also occurs frequently (James & Glaze, 2006). The estimates of how often assault happens are likely to be low, however, due to under-reporting, but otherwise, they are more likely than not to suffer in silence. Prisoners may be more likely to report an assault if they require medical attention. Rape is one of the most under-reported violent crimes in society as well as among the prison population. As such, findings on prison rape (as noted above) vary. But, in any case when considering the various types of violence found in prison, it is reasonable to conclude that the nation's prisoners (particularly males) are subject to a tremendous amount of aggression and physical force.

It is important to note that the population of inmates in the United States (U.S.) is, in absolute numbers, enormous (Human Rights Watch [HRW], 2001). Currently, the

country's prisons and jails have a population of 2,186,230 adults; therefore, the rate of incarceration in the United States is about 488 prisoners per 100,000 residents (BJS, 2006). Recently, the PEW foundation found that one in 100 Americans are in jail or prison (Warren, 2008). No other country in the world is known to incarcerate as many people, and only a small handful of countries have anything approaching a similar rate of incarceration as the U.S. (HRW, 2001). With the large numbers of inmates, the problem of prison violence becomes an especially salient issue. One particular form of violence that is a serious social problem in the American prison system is prison rape. Additionally, one could argue that PR is an especially interesting form of violence in prison because it is uniquely different in prison than it is on the outside. To elaborate, while men are the most likely victims of homicide, robbery, and assault both in and out of prison, experiencing rape is relatively unlikely on the outside but much more common for men on the inside.

How Much Prison Rape Is There?

The true rate and extent of prison rape is unknown. From the existing literature, a multitude of issues surround the problem of prison rape, and it becomes clear that there are several relevant themes and contextual definitions that permeate the problem of estimation. Though most scholars who research in this area agree that sexual assault in the nation's prisons is a serious problem, estimates vary as to the actual rates of victimization among inmates (Beck & Harrison, 2007; Davis, 1977; Donaldson, 1993; Dumond, 1992; Gilligan, 2000; Hensley, Tewksbury, & Castle, 2003; Lockwood, 1980; Messerschmidt, 2001; Nacci & Kane, 1983; Pinar, 2001; Struckman-Johnson,

Struckman-Johnson, Rucker, Bumby, & Donaldson, 1996; Wolff et al., 2006). Though the true rate and extent of prison rape is unknown, the consensus is that prison rape occurs enough to be a contributing factor to additional prison violence as well as to an overall climate of physical domination. As such, the question of why such vastly different estimates of sexual assault exist remains as important one. Several reasons for the differing rates have been posited: researchers have used inconsistent definitions to operationalize prison rape, scholars use different methods to collect information on prison rape, and prison rape is a particularly under-reported crime in the prison system.

Use of Multiple Definitions and Operationalizations

Scholars have utilized a wide variety of definitions and operationalizations when examining rape in prison. Tewksbury (1989) examined the fear of sexual assault in a sample of incarcerated males. Using a 60-item survey that included questions on demographics and perceptions on prison rape as well as actual experiences with sexual assault, his research found that none of the inmates in his sample had been sexually assaulted. However, the study did find that 7.1 percent of the inmates had been forcible approached for sex.

A more recent report on sexual violence in California's prisons found that 4.4 percent of the 322 randomly selected male inmates reported being raped while in a California prison. What is unique about this study is that it specifically examined a purposive sample of transgender inmates. With regards to this special population, the study found that 59 percent of the transgender inmates had been sexually assaulted; an amount 13 times more prevalent than that found among the general prison population. In

both samples, estimates of sexual assault were calculated from the inmate's answers to the question, "Have you ever had to do sexual things against your will with other inmates while incarcerated?" In this research, male inmates of all ages, races, and ethnicities reported incidents of sexual assault (Jenness, Maxon, Matsuda, & Sumner, 2007). Here, then, the estimation of prison rape (PR) was based on a unique definition of rape as well as a rarely utilized specific sample of inmates.

Lockwood (1980) used the term "sexual aggression" to denote sexual victimization. Further, he defined it as, "behavior which leads a man to feel that he is the target of aggressive sexual intentions" (p. 6). The problems with a definition such as this one is that what may be considered sexually aggressive to one individual many not necessarily be seen as sexually aggressive by another one. And, this definition could include threats of rape as well as actual behavior. Nonetheless, even using this broad definition, he found that only one inmate out of the 107 who consented to be interviewed had actually experienced being raped. However, 28 percent reported being targeted for sexual aggression (p. 597).

Compounding the problem of researchers not using any standardized type of definitions, multiple studies have collapsed sexual coercion, sexual assault, sexual misconduct, sexual abuse, and sexual victimization into one category and measured these differing types of incidents as only one type: rape (Dumond, 2000; Lockwood, 1980; Man & Cronan, 2001; McCorkle, 1992; Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 2000; Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996). Additionally, some studies (e.g., Kerbs & Jolly,

2007; Wolf et al., 2006) combined sexual victimization with physical victimization (e.g., assault) which further contributes to definitional confusion and inconsistency.

In 2004, as part of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), the BJS developed standardized definitions of sexual violence for researchers to use when examining male prison rape (Wolff, Shi, Bachman, & Siegel, 2008). To start, all incidents of inmate on inmate sexual assault involving sexual contact with another person without his consent, fall on a continuum. The most serious of these incidents are the non-consensual sexual acts which include: contact between the penis and the anus including penetration, however slight, or contact between the mouth and the penis or anus, or penetration of the anal opening of another person by a hand, a finger, or another object. At the other end of the continuum, the least serious of these sexually violent incidents include abusive sexual contact which includes: intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person. The lower end of the continuum may also encompass incidents where the intention was to sexually exploit (e.g., pimping put the inmate to satisfy a debt) rather than to harm or debilitate (BJS, 2007b). The creation of standardized definitions by PREA is exciting and promising for the field of prison violence. But as of yet, researchers have not published any articles using these standard classifications, so issues of validity and reliability are still on the horizon.

Even so, BJS has provided some estimations of PR. According to their latest report (2007b), the most recent statistics assert that only about 17 percent of allegations of sexual violence in the prison system were substantiated. As such, more than half of the

allegations were unable to be verified.¹ Further, the BJS found that of the substantiated acts about 14 percent of them were inmate on inmate non-consensual sex acts (i.e., anal penetration) with an additional 19 percent of the incidents being categorized as inmate on inmate abusive sexual contacts (i.e., intentional touching of the genitalia).

Subsequently, Beck and Harrison (2007) also analyzed these data collected by BJS. They used the PREA standardized terms such as a nonconsensual sexual acts which were defined as unwanted or unwilling contacts that involved anal or oral sex, handjobs, and other sexual acts; and terms such as abusive sexual contacts which were defined as unwanted contact that involved touching of the inmate's butt, thighs, or penis in a sexual way. They found a prison rape estimation of 2.1 percent rate of inmate-on-inmate sexual victimization.

As can be seen, previous research supports the assertion that definitions are varied or missing entirely (Chonco, 1989; Hensley, Koscheski, & Tewksbury, 2005; Hensley et al., 2003; Lockwood, 1980; Moss, Hosford, & Anderson, 1979; Nacci & Kane, 1983; Saum, Surratt, Inciardi, & Bennett, 1995; Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996; Wooden & Parker, 1982). Indeed according to Saum et al. (1995), "A large amount of studies do not make any effort to define the sexual terminology either to the inmates who are being interviewed or to the readers who must interpret the researchers' findings" (p. 418). Perhaps, the PREA's effort in this area will lead the way to significant advancement in the literature.

¹ This also implies that another reason for varied prison rape estimates is the process of substantiation. It may happen for example that, like in a court of law, the lack of certain kinds of evidence allows actual rapes to remain unsubstantiated.

Methods of Data Collection

In addition to the confusion created by different definitions, another issue to be considered is the differing methods used to collect the data. For the majority of studies, the primary means of collecting data involved face-to-face interviews where researchers spoke directly to the inmates or to correctional officers. For example, using this methodology, Hensley et al. (2003) interviewed 174 inmates and found that about 14 percent were sexually threatened but only one percent had been sexually assaulted. Interestingly enough they attempted to interview 300 inmates however, only 174 agreed to participate, clearly illustrating the reluctance of some inmates to be interviewed on such a sensitive topic.

Other researchers have used qualitative interviewing methods whereby inmates and/or correctional staff were queried about their experiences with the sexual coercion of inmates. Chonco (1989) interviewed 40 inmates housed at a pre-release center. Using an interview schedule as a guide, questions were open-ended and general in that the residents discussed the problem of PR without getting personal about their own experiences. The data were analyzed in order to examine reoccurring themes reported by the inmates about who the offenders and victims were. In other words, Chonco was not looking for rates of victimization or offending, therefore, no estimates are reported in the article. Indeed, Chonco (1989) was looking to identify who the most likely victims and offenders were. Davis (1977) also employed this methodology. He interviewed over 3,000 inmates in the Philadelphia Prison System and found that the problem of PR was “epidemic” (p. 108). He goes on to state that “virtually every slightly-built young man

has been approached for sex within a day or two of his admission to jail” (Davis, 1977, p. 108). However, he does not give a definitive count of how many inmates are approached or actually raped.

Using a different population sample and data collection method, Eigenberg (2000) administered surveys to all correctional officers (COs) employed in a mid-western rural state. The survey was designed to ascertain how the officers defined rape in prison and evaluate how they arrived at these definitions, therefore no estimates were calculated. This survey was administered through inter-departmental mail and had a response rate of 53 percent. A lower response rate occurred in Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson’s (2000) study; however, they administered surveys to inmates and not COs. They ascertained that approximately 21 percent of inmates in their sample had been sexually assaulted. However, only 25 percent of the inmates returned the anonymous surveys so this estimation is likely to be quite low. Non-response is a common problem with mailed or otherwise distributed surveys.

Using still another source of information, one study reviewed institutional records. Fuller and Orsagh (1977) analyzed the Offense Report Data Base which counted all reported assaults within the 10 North Carolina prisons during the last quarter of the year, 1975. They found a sexual victimization rate of 1.7 percent in their sample. These conclusions were based on reported assaults to prison officials, however, and again, there is no telling how many assaults went unreported.

Lastly, one study used mixed methods of analysis to research the problem of PR. Wooden and Parker (1982) administered two self-report surveys to a sample of 600

inmates. The response rate was approximately 25 percent. Here, they found that out of the 200 returned surveys, about 16 percent had been sexually assaulted. They also conducted face-to-face open-ended interviews on a sample of 30 homosexual inmates. They found that all of these inmates had been targets of sexual aggression. So, here then, even if scholars used similar if not equivalent definitions, these varying methods and samples would likely produce divergent estimates of PR. And the problem of PR going unreported emerges as yet another issue with which scholars must contend when estimating the prevalence of PR.

Under Reporting of Prison Rape

Another reason why rates of sexual assault are contradictory may be the failure of inmates to report their victimization to prison officials (Kunselman, Tewksbury, Dumond, & Dumond, 2002). There are several reasons for the lack of reporting, one of which is that male victims may be perceived as being weak, unable to defend their manhood, and that reporting their assaults might make them appear as “snitches” which also carries a risk of being sexually assaulted (Kunselman et al., 2002, p. 37).

Additionally, inmates may not report their victimization to researchers either. For example, Wooden and Parker’s 1982 research had a near 75 percent non-response rate. Whether administering a survey or using the open-ended question technique, face-to-face interviews present challenges as the topic of prison rape is extremely sensitive, and many inmates may not to cooperate with researchers. Often, there is no incentive for doing so, and similar issues arise when reporting to researchers as when reporting to prison officials (e.g., appearing as a snitch).

Another issue that arises here is one of not being believed or being taken seriously. It may happen that an inmate does report a sexual assault only to have the COs fail to follow up or fail to believe him (Groth & Birnbaum, 1979; Scarce, 1997). If this happens, it may be a doubly dangerous situation in that the inmate is now a snitch and may be targeted for more violence and the correctional authorities failed to believe him.

Factors Associated With Prison Sexual Victimization

Even with these problems of consistency, among definitions, methods, and samples used as well as under-reporting, scholars have advanced the literature in this area by examining the factors associated with PR victimization. While the prevalence and incidence of PR is important, knowing which inmates are more likely to be targeted for sexual victimization is also vital. The issue of identifying inmates more likely to be targeted is important for the simple reason of prevention. Knowing who is at risk, can help correctional administrators to develop prevention programs. Therefore, according to previous literature, several factors and themes appear to contribute to the problem of prison rape. While the total amount of rape in prison is still largely undetermined, some aspects of its composition are well accepted among scholars.

Race and Ethnicity

It is clear from the majority of research in this area that race is a major factor in prison rape. By far, the most common scenario is a Black inmate raping a White inmate (e.g., BJS, 2007b; Carroll, 1977; Hensley et al., 2005; Hensley et al., 2003; Scacco, 1975; Toch, 1977). This is a particularly compelling finding as among the non-institutionalized

members of society this crime is typically intra-racial. These findings have held up over time and have prompted researchers to posit several explanations as to why the crime of prison rape is overwhelmingly interracial. Several authors have argued that the main reason for Blacks raping Whites is revenge for having suffered the consequences of long-term institutionalized racism. Struckman-Johnson and Struckman-Johnson (2000) found that 60 percent of the targets of sexual assault were White while 74 percent of the sexual assault perpetrators were Black. Other studies have found similar results, albeit with slightly different proportions. For example, one study found that 58 percent of individuals targeted for sexual assault were White (Hensley et al., 2005). In an earlier study, scholars found that 73.1 percent of prison rape targets were White (Hensley et al., 2003). The most recent study conducted by the BJS found that males constituted 85 percent of the perpetrators and 82 percent of the victims in prison with Whites making up about 72 percent of the victims (BJS, 2007a).

Sexual Orientation

Other factors have also emerged as explanations for why some inmates are more likely to be targeted for prison rape such as perceived or expressed sexual orientation. Several studies have found that if an inmate is perceived or declares himself to be homosexual, he has a high probability of being sexually assaulted (e.g., Hensley et al., 2005). An early study by Wooden and Parker (1982) found that 41 percent of the homosexual inmates in their sample had been sexually assaulted. Nacci and Kane (1983) found that 70 percent of the rape victims in their research self-identified as homosexual. They supposed that the targeting of these individuals might have meant that they were

considered more willing to occupy the passive female victim role (Nacci & Kane, 1983). Additionally, a 1989 study by Chonco contended that victims of sexual assault often exhibited traditional female behavior and that this may have lead to them having been perceived as homosexual and thus, targeted for sexual victimization.

Physical Size

Another group who is often targeted for sexual assault is men who are smaller in stature. Men who are physically smaller are seen as more feminine and as a result are often targeted for rape (Chonco, 1989; Dumond, 2000; Groth & Birnbaum, 1979; Lockwood, 1980; Wooden & Parker, 1982). Also, men who are smaller and more feminine may be seen as weak and vulnerable. Indeed, they may actually be weaker and less able to ward off physical aggression.

Prison Roles

Yet another group that is well accepted among scholars as being highly vulnerable to rape is inmates who are snitches or thought to be snitches (HRW, 2001; Lockwood, 1980; Scacco, 1975; Wooden & Parker, 1982). It is thought that their rapes are retaliation for reporting prison goings-on to authorities and for the subsequent disruption of the prison subculture.

Sex Offenders

A final group mentioned briefly in the literature is sex offenders (e.g., Lockwood, 1980; Scacco, 1975). However, this literature is older and does not specify whom these individuals offended against (e.g., children or adults). Even so, this research typically

finds that child molesters are more likely to be targeted for PR. Recent research has not covered this population in depth so it remains to be seen if they are still at a higher risk for sexual assault victimization.

Consequences of Prison Rape

Researchers have argued that rape in prison creates medical and emotional trauma, loss of identity, mental health problems, and of particular concern, the spread of HIV and AIDS (e.g., Dumond, 2000). Additionally, once an inmate has been raped, they are targeted for repeated sexual victimization and are often traded or loaned out for favors (Dumond, 2000). One study found that once an inmate has been raped, he is likely to be raped on average eight more times (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996). These repeated victimizations increase the chances of inmates experiencing the various traumas associated with PR.

Medical Trauma

From the most current statistics available, it is known that in 2006, 21,890 inmates in Federal and State prisons were known to be infected with HIV/AIDS (BJS, 2006). In 2004, HIV/AIDS accounted for approximately 6 percent of all deaths in Federal and State prisons (BJS, 2006). Further, it has been argued that prison rape undermines the public health by contributing to the spread of HIV/AIDS. Indeed, the rate of HIV/AIDS infection in U.S. prisons is more than three times the general population (BJS, 2006). Considering that in 1999 alone, there were more than 10,000,000 separate admissions to and discharges from prisons and jails. Therefore, the consequences of an infected inmate

transmitting the disease to another inmate appear to be a very real issue to consider (U.S. House of Representatives, 2000).

However, HIV/AIDS is not the only medical trauma to consider when researching PR. Inmates who have been raped are likely to suffer other serious medical traumas. This is further exacerbated by the fact that male prison rape victims are often raped more than one time (Dumond & Dumond, 2002). One study found that 16 percent of victimized inmates sustained physical injuries as a result of rape (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996). Raped inmates are likely to present with physical indications of rape, including anal bruising, anal bleeding, anal fissures, and/or tears in the anal area, a torn frenulum, missing or loose teeth; bruises, welts, bite marks and injuries to the skull or other bones (Calderwood, 1987; Dumond, 1992; Wallace, 2002). Immediately after the rape, many victims experience physical shock which often includes symptoms of feeling cold, feeling faint, feeling disoriented, feeling nauseous, as well as trembling and vomiting (Hansson, 1992).

Emotional Trauma

Many victims of rape, both male and female, also experience emotional injuries such as rape trauma syndrome (RTS). RTS is the term used by those in the nursing and psychiatric profession, to identify a specific set of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) behaviors that survivors of rape specifically, often experience (Hansson, 1992). Symptoms include flashbacks of the assault, anxiety attacks, depression, hypervigilance, a feeling of being dirty, contaminated, or unclean, severe mood swings, nightmares, insomnia or other sleep disorders, and suicidal ideation. Donaldson (2001) has argued

that for victimized male inmates PR is life threatening as the victim will often commit suicide. Further, the raped inmate cannot escape his attacker or other would-be attackers or take time to try and heal his emotional wounds. All of these emotional problems are in addition to the physical trauma that most male victims of sexual assault experience.

Rehabilitation Disruption

The effects of these physical and emotional traumas must certainly affect the rehabilitation process and how these victims will adjust once they return to regular society. For instance, some criminologists have found that inmates who have been raped, leave prison more violent and more anti-social then when they started their sentences (Dumond, 1992; Gilligan, 2000).

The “brutalization effect” associated with prison rape may be particularly important because of who is often targeted for sexual assault (McGuire, 2005, p.76). Those who are victimized are often young, nonviolent, first-time offenders for whom rehabilitation is a realistic goal (Man & Cronan, 2001). If the least dangerous of the prison population is the most victimized, then prison rape is probably seriously undermining the potential reformative impact of prison. This is especially important when one considers the impact of violent victimization on this population of prisoners, because when these individuals are released, they may be far more prone to violence. It is troubling to consider that there are a significant number of inmates who are physically and emotionally traumatized when they are released from prison. This is particularly so considering the main goal of prisoner reentry is to “primarily increase public safety and reduce offender recidivism” the problem of prison rape victims reentering society

becomes a matter of general safety and public health (Office of Justice Programs, 2007, p. 1). Next, Chapter Three discusses the Fleisher and Krienert study, whose data I use for this research.

CHAPTER THREE: FLEISHER AND KRIENERT RESEARCH STUDY

Fleisher and Krienert made a significant contribution to the prison literature with their research entitled, “Ethno-Methodological Study of the Subculture of Prison Inmate Sexuality in the United States, 2004-2005.” There were many benefits and advances of this study. One, this study is qualitative. Data were collected via in-depth interviews of prisoners. Two, the authors were able to interview 409 inmates which is a large sample size and with the exception of Davis (1977) larger than any previous research. Three, this study used respondents from 23 male prisons in 10 different states. This allows for a more broader interpretation of the data. Fourth, Fleisher and Krienert utilized a theoretical paradigm in explaining their findings, whereas previous research is primarily descriptive.

The Fleisher and Krienert research study was designed to examine the culture of prison inmate sexual violence. Consequently, the authors’ goal was to gain an objective analysis of inmates’ subjective perceptions of prison sex and sexual violence (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006). The authors assert, “The project was a cultural study that would yield prison inmates’ ways of interpreting prison sexual behavior and sexual violence” (p. 59). They further argue that “Our goal was to understand prison rape as a cultural concept, a cultural artifact, which inmates may know something about even if they’d never been raped or threatened or intimidated by a physical or sexual threat” (p. 59). Fleisher and Krienert (2006) go on to state, “The cultural research issue focuses on process and contextual issues as inmates see them, for instance, was a sexual threat the result of a card game debt?” (p. 59). In addition, Fleisher and Krienert sought to investigate the

subjective reality of prison rape for inmates. The authors' intentions were to examine how inmates acquired knowledge of prison rape through language, witnessing, and listening to others. Simply put, the researchers sought to answer the questions, "What is the meaning of rape within prison inmate culture?" Using qualitative interviews, they sought to collect the contextual meaning of sexual violence in prison culture. This is a significant divergence and enhancement from the previous literature in this area. Prior to Fleisher and Krienert, much literature was descriptive and not often placed within an explanatory theoretical framework. By focusing on culture, Fleisher and Krienert opened the door to a richer interpretation of these previously descriptive findings.

The Main Findings

Fleisher and Krienert found what they term several substantive and conceptual themes that emerged from their discussions with inmates. Substantive themes refer to an inmate's behavior either directly or indirectly, while conceptual themes are more abstract. The substantive themes identified by Fleisher and Krienert are that most rapes occur at night in cells. Also, certain inmates are more likely to be targeted for prison rape. For example, inmates with debts may be raped and those who refuse to repay debts are even more likely to be raped. White inmates because they generally know fewer inmates on the inside are more likely to be raped. Also, new inmates are vulnerable to rape, child sex offenders may be raped at higher levels, and physically small inmates are more likely to be raped than large inmates.

Additionally, Fleisher and Krienert noted the substantive theme that some inmates worry about rape while others do not. Interestingly, Fleisher and Krienert commented that

prisoners found various ways to adapt to the threat of PR. Consent to same-sex relations worked as an adaptation to the threats of prison life for some inmates, strategies such as ‘riding’ with a gang, joining a religious group, and hanging out with experienced inmates, are adaptations that inmates made in order to gain safety and be protected. Many of these substantive themes are supported by previous literature on prison rape (Chonco, 1989; Lockwood, 1980).

In regards to conceptual themes, which, the authors note, are highly abstract and represent a complex set of cultural norms and values, several were identified. The conceptual themes identified are that inmates who are perceived to be mentally weak are raped more easily than mentally tough inmates. Here, the degree of toughness refers to an inmate’s decision to stand up and be a man and be beaten up instead of raped, White inmates are considered both mentally and physically weak and cannot fight as well as Black inmates, so, they are easier targets for PR. Further, inmates who were homosexuals in the community command more respect from the general population than mentally weak inmates who are afraid or refuse to acknowledge their homosexuality or those who engage in homosexual acts purely out of fear. These inmates are contemptible and must be forcibly ‘turned out.’ Additionally, if a man believes he can be raped he may as well have already been raped, but PR is really more of a misnomer, since men who are “raped” really wanted it, so they really were not raped at all and lastly, male inmates may choose to remain outside the homosexual scene. These conceptual themes illustrate clearly, in this hyper-aggressive environment any indication of weakness whatsoever is

contemptible, and within the prison culture weakness should be unendingly punished, exploited, and vilified.

Fleisher and Krienert (2006) use Clemmer's Theory of Culture to frame their discussion. Clemmer suggested that inmates acclimate, to a greater or lesser extent, to the folkways, customs, mores, and general culture of the penitentiary. This assimilation is known as prisonization. According to Clemmer, every prisoner is subject to these influences which, in effect, teach new prisoners a new way of life. This new culture/way of life includes learning acceptance of an inferior role as compared with the correctional officers (e.g., cleaning toilets), the accumulation of facts which concern the operation, structure, and important patterns of the prison (e.g., avoid debts to other prisoners), the adoption of new habits or routines of prison life (e.g., sleeping, eating, working), and the adoption of new language (e.g., Guard! On the gate!), and new behaviors (e.g., knowing who is behind you at all times). He goes on to assert that so widespread and complete is the assimilation to prison culture that it makes inmates become entirely characteristic of the prison community. This complete and total change in lifestyle sufficiently disrupts inmates' personalities to the point where an adequate adjustment to any post-incarceration community is extremely challenging at best (Clemmer as cited in Hawkins, 1982).

Clemmer goes on to assert that knowledge about prison culture is transferred from older and more experienced inmates to new inmates through language. The overall effect of this form of cultural transmission ensures that many generations of inmates have inherited their knowledge about prison culture from preceding generations. This theory

then suggests that the current generation of prisoners learned prisonization and all its encompassing rules from earlier generations of inmates who verbally informed them of how the prison “works” (Clemmer as cited in Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

Here, then, similar to the transmission of culture in any community, the culture in prison is long-standing and correspondingly resistant to change. Using Clemmer as a framework for their analysis, Fleisher and Krienert (2006) found five cultural themes that addressed what inmates had seen and heard about prison rape. The first finding was that only 22 percent of the inmates reported having known for certain that a rape had occurred in their institution, conversely, 78 percent had not. This finding demonstrates that even though hearing about rape from other inmates is a part of inmate culture, it does not appear to be an overriding cultural force in the prison. The second finding asserted that the inmates in their study who reporting hearing about high levels of rape, were not necessarily influenced by these accounts. It appears that Clemmer’s theory supports Fleisher and Krienert’s findings in that knowledge of prison rape tells inmates that prison rape is a frequent and serious occurrence. However, as the prison culture also tells inmates that only certain individuals are at risk for prison sexual assault. It may be that inmates may believe that since they do not fit into the victim paradigm, they should not worry about being raped. The third finding reported that verbal messages that prisoners had heard about rape were not supported by having actually witnessed a rape. Hence, in the prison culture, perhaps hearing about a particular issue does not necessarily influence an inmates behavior per se. The fourth finding reported was that despite hearing and in some cases seeing prison rape, inmates do not express fear or worry about prison rape,

hence the inmates do not necessarily feel they need to change their behavior. Placed within the framework of Clemmer, Fleisher and Krienert interpreted that these themes were verbal messages of prison culture which conveyed messages about sexual violence, further, these messages communicate to the inmates critical lessons about prison culture.

With regards to the inmates' views on prison rapists, Fleisher and Krienert (2006) found that a majority of inmates stated that rapists were negatively stigmatized and may be targets for violence. However, when the researchers asked if the inmates had ever known of a rapist who had been killed (i.e., the target of the ultimate form of violence), 75 percent said that they had not. According to Fleisher and Krienert (2006), rapists have "no power, no respect, and no influence" (p. 139). In an interesting twist, the study also found that a "turn-out" artist (also known as a "Bootie Bandit") or someone who initiates a prison rape through coercion without the actual use of physical force does not carry a "rapist's negative stigma" (p. 142). Here, unlike the rapist, the "bootie bandit" does not fear the potential violent retaliation that may come from his fellow prisoners even if the other prisoners despise him (p. 143). Fleisher and Krienert (2006) give no indication why the bootie bandit is unafraid of violent retaliation. Further, even given these supposed negative views of both rapists and bootie bandits, both are seen as having characteristics worthy of respect. Here, utilizing Clemmer's theoretical focus, Fleisher and Krienert indicated that rapists and bootie bandits are dark shadows of prison culture and that they are embodiments of valued personal traits such as: "being verbally adept, socially clever, manipulative and always on the prowl for a profitable hustle" (p. 144). It appears that the

culture of prison rape is contradictory and convoluted as rapists are seen in both positive and negative ways.

As further evidence of this, Fleisher and Krienert (2006) found that in the culture of these prisons, victims are at fault for their own rapes. Here it appears that inmates presume that rape can be avoided, thus if a rape occurs, it is the victim who is the sexual manipulator. It is also the victim who is attempting to gain something by playing a game. There is one very pervasive and powerful rationale for this viewpoint, which is the concept of the “Inner Homosexual” or one’s “True Homosexual Nature” (p. 147, 148). Indeed, during the interviews many inmates asserted that other inmates were not raped *per se* because they already desired sex with men due to their sexual orientation. From the inmates’ point of view then, homosexuals (whether out or closeted) cannot be sexually assaulted against their will. Consequently, some inmates believe that rapists and bootie bandits may be entitled to the sex they have taken. But many inmates did not feel this way. To illustrate, only 87 inmates believed that perpetrators were at liberty to assault whomever they wanted, whereas 217 felt quite the opposite. These contradictions clearly illustrate that the beliefs and behaviors regarding prison rape are complex. And, these convoluted aspects become part of the prison experience and mantra.

To elaborate, according to Fleisher and Krienert’s interpretation of Clemmer’s theory, the inner homosexual is a powerful symbolic in prison culture. This symbol acts on a sexual cultural continuum of social respect, in that those who are openly gay are seen in a positive light whereas, men who must be forced (i.e., raped) to see their true sexual nature are despised and reside at the very bottom of the hierarchy. Therefore, there

is no such thing as a rapist, indeed the responsibility for the sexual assault is on the victim who had to be shown his real sexual identity.

Fleisher and Krienert suggest that in this hyper-aggressive culture, should a rapist manage to complete the victimization of his intended target, the victim has several options. The first choice many inmates make is to retaliate or respond with such severe violence that the clear intention is to maim or kill the rapist. According to Fleisher and Krienert's (2006) findings, however, in these cases, victims who choose this option do not regain their earlier reputations, but continue to be considered weak. Further, this lowered status applies not only to the victim but also to his friends. Hence, "Retaliation does not elevate their status and reputation" (p. 210). This is inconsistent with previous findings in the literature which state that they can regain their manhood through violence (e.g., Scacco, 1982). Further, it suggests that inmates who are raped, even if they respond aggressively are still considered as asking for it, so they would be targets for continual sexual aggression or harassment.

The second option the victim has is to report his rape. However, reporting puts victims at risk for being labeled snitches and this puts them at risk for repeated sexual victimization because snitches are seen as disruptive and lower on the prison hierarchy. Consequently, victims who take this option fare little better than those that take the first option. This is consistent with previous literature (HRW, 2001; Lockwood, 1980; Scacco, 1975; Wooden & Parker, 1982).

The third choice the victim has is to go into protective custody (PC), which depending on the prison may be a safe option, but it also may not be. Many inmates claim

that PC is not safe because prison rapists can also transfer into PC and continue harassing their victims. Therefore, this is often not an option that lowers their risks for victimization. In PC, inmates can also request a transfer to another prison, but this can also be problematic, because their reputations will likely follow them to new facilities, thus, their higher risks for victimization follow as well. Previous literature makes no mention of this issue (Fleisher and Krienert, 2006).

Sadly, inmates have another “choice” and it is one some choose to make. They may become the “wives” of their rapists or other inmates and continue to trade sex for safety from other inmates or in other areas of prison life. In these cases, the sex does not stop, but it may be less violent and injury-laden. Obviously, in terms of responsibility for the sexual assault, the onus is on the victim and not the rapist to make a decision about how to respond, and given the choices and consequences of them, none are likely to be particularly appealing to a raped inmate. These choices are also clear indicators that the beliefs and routines surrounding prison rape are imbedded in the social networking and structure of prison life, particularly since they may follow an inmate from one prison to another. These relatively winless choices illustrate Clemmer’s theory of prisonization by indicating to inmates that the experiences they have with prison rape are fairly unchangeable. And, that the culture surrounding victimization is unrelenting as well. Victims continue to be victims, and no matter their choices, they will likely be victims until their releases.

Though, this research does contribute to the literature on the topic of prison rape, the dataset and accompanying report on Fleischer and Krienert’s findings have some

weaknesses. In regards to the final report on their findings, Fleischer and Krienert (2006) do discuss the methodology used to collect their data and identify themes. Indeed, they assert that they used ethnographic methodology and that the data was collected via inmate interviews which were analyzed by thematic analysis. Fleischer and Krienert (2006) further state that they generated the questions for their interviews by “conducting unstructured interviews with former inmates” (p. 72). However, it appears from the interview transcripts that the interviewers read the interview questions to the inmates in a linear fashion without follow-up questions exploring the answers inmates gave. Thus, it appears that interviewers went on to the next question and did not get inmates to elaborate on cued themes. Therefore, it looks as if the interviews were conducted more like surveys being administered rather than true open-ended ethnographic interviews. Consequently, it may be that certain themes and topics that might have provided a richer and deeper interpretation of what the inmates’ comments meant went unexamined.

Further though many qualitative studies use grounded theory: a process whereby data is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through a systematic collection and analysis of data pertaining to an event or phenomenon. Also, in grounded theory, data collection, analysis, and theory are in a mutual relationship with each other. Consequently, the researcher does not start with a theory in place and then prove it, indeed, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant emerges as a result of the systematic examination of data (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). With regards as to whether

Fleischer and Krienert used grounded theory in their research project, it is never made clear in their study.²

Though certainly a valid and informative study, like all research it is not perfect. While reviewing the transcripts, it became apparent that despite the researcher's best efforts to place their findings within the theoretical context of culture, there was one main overarching theme that the researchers did not discuss: the theme of masculinities or the expectation of how men must act simply because they are male. The men in this study accounted for many behaviors, responses, and actions because in their words, men must act like men or they will be viewed as women. Consequently, within a hyper-masculine culture, it is impossible to rape a "man" only "women" or the effeminate can be raped. Like a few other institutions (e.g., law enforcement, and the military), prison is considered to be a hyper-masculine environment, meaning that the inmates and others are acting out the negative extremes of hegemonic masculinity: those of "criminal, pathological, and violent behaviors" (Kimmel & Aronson, 2003, p. 418).

Thus, as a real man has a man's physical strength, has a strong mind, and has the wherewithal to stand up and fight back with extreme violence, in the context of PR, only feminine men who are weak are targeted for sexual assault in prison. In this way then, these beliefs about masculinity emerged from the larger society so it is unlikely that they are the result of prisonization, but instead are the result of the overarching viewpoints about masculinity from society which are reenacted in prison. Accordingly, the problem of prison rape is less the result of a distinct prison culture, and more because of the larger

² Repeated attempts to contact Fleischer and Krienert went unanswered.

culture's messages about masculinity that are played out in this micro-environment. Thus using the theory of masculinity to explain why these individuals do what they do is a logical alternative theoretical application that merits another perspective on these data.

In sum, this chapter offered a comprehensive literature review of the previous research on the problem of prison rape including: a discussion of the differing methods of data collection, how prison rape definitions differ from study-to-study, prevalence and incidence rates of prison rape, a discussion of victim characteristics (e.g., race, sexual orientation, and social characteristics), rape trauma syndrome, AIDS, and other emotional and physical effects on prison rape victims.

This section also discussed the Fleischer and Krienert dataset and final report. The dataset has a large qualitative sample of 409 interviews which is the second largest dataset of this nature. These data were collected from 23 different high-security correctional institutions from 10 different states, which allows for a broader interpretation of the findings. In addition to Clemmer's Theory of Prisonization which was used to frame Fleischer and Krienert's analysis, also discussed were the substantive and conceptual findings in Fleischer and Krienert research. Themes of race, sexual orientation, and culture are identified and discussed as well as the strengths and weaknesses of their study. In Chapter Four, I describe and elaborate on the theory of masculinity.

CHAPTER FOUR: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I examine the major tenants of masculinity theory as they relate to the problem of prison rape. Specifically, the broad themes of masculinity, the behavioral expectations of masculinity, the situational and hierarchal nature of masculinity, and how these expectations relate to prison rape.

Masculinity Theory

In order to consider the importance of being masculine to men, as well as the role various types of behaviors play in men's efforts to be men, it is important to understand what masculinities are. Connell (1995) defines masculinity "as a place in gender relations, the practice through which men engage that place in gender and the effects of these practices in bodily experience, personality and culture" (p. 71). What Connell means by this statement is that rather than attempting to define masculinity, we should be focusing on "the processes and relationships through which men and women conduct gendered lives" (p. 71). Even so, Bolai (2009) asserts that masculinity is, "The body of characteristics conventionally understood to be desirable in men." As such, it is important to understand not only what types of attributes are considered male, but how men come to lean and internalize these traits. In this way, masculinity is an ever-present element in the lives of men or, said another way: male culture.

Being masculine is important in the lives of men for the simple fact that their behavior appears to be under constant scrutiny and this constant pressure to be seen as men, as manly, or as masculine shapes many decisions that they make even if these

decisions put them at personal risk. For example, many men avoid going to the doctor because being seen as sick means being seen as weak and weakness is a feminine trait (Levant & Pollack, 2003). This alone is a particularly disturbing finding, given that on average men die far sooner than women. The difference between male and female mortality rates is seen in all major causes of death, namely heart disease, cancer, car accidents, homicide, and suicide (Lippa, Martin, & Friedman, 2000).

According to proponents of this theory, there are several broad themes of masculinity: for example, building on a foundation of previous research, Brannon (1976) identified the four main wide-ranging themes of masculinity: those of “no sissy stuff” (i.e., no behavior that could be construed as feminine, such as indecisiveness or crying), “be a big wheel” (e.g., status and achievement oriented actions, for instance, being the quarterback of the football team), “be a sturdy oak” (e.g., inexpressiveness and independence, in other words, never show weakness or ask for help), and lastly, “give ‘em hell” (e.g., traditional masculine aggression with particular emphasis on sexuality, for example having sex with as many women as possible). In contemporary context, the term masculinity assumes that a man’s behavior results from the type of man one is, which is to say that a man who is not manly would behave quite differently than being a manly man. For example, a non-manly man might be peaceable rather than violent, subordinate rather than dominant, and/or uninterested in sports, and sexual conquest (Connell, 1995).

Connell (1995) argues that masculinities are not “fixed in advance of social interaction, but are constructed in interaction” (p. 35). As such, masculinity is dependent

on setting or social location. It is with these conditions in mind when he asserts that several common themes are clear in the process of identifying what is masculine: the construction of masculinity happens in everyday life, institutional structures, as well as individuals are important in the transmission of masculinity, differences in what is masculine exist and are significant based in membership in social groups. These differences in what it means to be “a man” are constructed using social traits such as race, class, sexual orientation, as well as behavioral traits such as physical prowess, the use of violence, and having as many female sex partners as possible.

Connell (1995) further suggests that there are different types of masculinities, and he puts forth the concept that, “To recognize diversity in masculinities is not enough. We must recognize the relations between the different kinds of masculinities: relations of alliance, dominance, and subordination” (p. 37). At the dominant end of the spectrum is the “hegemonic male” (p. 76). The hegemonic male is the one who is able to assert the successful claim to authority and often uses violence to support his status (Connell, 1995). For example, many men will respond with violence if another man insults them in a public situation. We see this phenomenon in escalation homicides, a situation where one man insults another, a fight breaks out, and the man who lost the fight returns moments later with a firearm. One man subsequently uses the gun to kill the other, thereby regaining his masculine status. Hegemonic masculinity is the prevailing type of masculinity (or ideal type) to which all other types of masculinity are compared and found subordinate. This hegemony is based, in part, on the willingness to use violence, but also on a hierarchy of sexualities with the heterosexual male at the top. Consequently,

in the hierarchy of masculinities, men who are seen as more feminine or gay are in the subordinate category, thus lower-status males are those that are defined in terms of lowered sexuality and heightened femininity (Connell, 1995).

However, the differences in masculinities are not just categorized as being between heterosexual and homosexual men or men who can be violent and those who would avoid violence, indeed, there are differences in how other men perform and assert their masculinity. For example, working-class White men assert their masculinity differently than men who are higher in socio-economic standing, as do men of color (Connell, 1995). To illustrate, masculinity has come to be associated with being the primary breadwinner in a relationship or family. This presents a problem for men of color, as due to structural impediments (e.g., employer discrimination, living in an area where transportation is not available to areas with better jobs), they are often unable to earn a living wage much less get a job. Consequently, many men of color must gain and maintain masculine status through other means, such as being willing to engage in violence or having multiple sex partners, which gains them respect even in the face of their lower economic achievement (Anderson, 2000). As another example, Black men who have been denied opportunity often internalize and project the image of the gangster or thug (Reese, 2003). For some Black men, this is the only method with which to achieve status, and thus be seen as masculine men.

Working-class White men also demonstrate their masculinity with the use of violence towards “others.” Traditionally, White working class men have maintained their solidarity and dominance over men of color, men who are homosexual, and women

through unions, sports, and closed shop floors (e.g., Blacks may be able to join the union, but they are prohibited from working in certain shops). Increasingly, however, these barriers have been legally lifted and lower-class White men have found their areas of dominance infiltrated by women and men of color. These men then are engaging in violence (especially towards gays) in order to find alternate ways to maintain working-class male solidarity (Embrick, Walther, & Wickens, 2007).

Though Connell (1995) identified the differing masculinities, his argument that masculinities are socially constructed is based on the foundational work of West and Zimmerman (1987). West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that gender is the product of cultural or social doings of some sort. They also contend that gender is a routine accomplishment embedded in everyday interaction” (p. 125). Further, West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that gender is something that people do in their social interactions, and as such, they contend that the “doing of gender is undertaken by women and men whose competence as members of society is hostage to its production” (p. 126).

West and Zimmerman (1987) also argue that doing gender means creating differences between women and men and that these differences are not natural, essential or biological. Instead, they are socially constructed. Differences that are constructed are used to reinforce the essentialness of gender. West and Zimmerman (1987) argue that these purported biological differences are seen as normal and natural behavior for men and women, but in fact, these behaviors are socially constructed and then used to reinforce fundamental beliefs about gender. West and Zimmerman (1987) further argue

that, “if gender is done appropriately then we are simultaneously sustaining, reproducing, and legitimizing the institutional arrangements that are based on sex category” (p. 146).

West and Zimmerman (1987) also argue that a person’s actions are often designed with an eye to their accountability and how they might look and how they might be categorized by others. Accountability is the possibility of describing behaviors in serious and consequential ways—most notably as masculine or feminine behaviors (West & Zimmerman, 1987). It is also the knowledge that others may view one’s behaviors and evaluate their masculinity (or femininity) and find it satisfactory or not. Consequently, once a man realizes that his behavior is subject to accountability, and that he may be asked to explain his behavior and prove his masculinity, he understands that virtually any behavior he engages in “may be held accountable for performance of that activity as a *man*” (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 136). Additionally, individuals conform to specific behaviors so as to satisfy the “requirements” of accountability, meaning that they demonstrate that they are in fact “real men.” Thus, they present or “do their gender” so they are unquestionably seen by others in social situations as expressing their maleness and evaluated as being gender appropriate (West & Zimmerman, 1987). Accounts are important because they are used to create an impression of ourselves to others (Johnson, 1995). It is important to note that doing gender is not always to live up to normative conceptions of masculinity or femininity; it is to engage in gendered behavior “*at the risk of gender assessment*” (emphasis added) (West & Zimmerman, 1987, p. 136). Gender assessment is when someone evaluates another’s performance or impression, sometimes

calling into question a person's competency as a male or a female based on behaviors that are deemed unmasculine or unfeminine.

It is in this way that masculinities are social accomplishments and not fixed essential (i.e., biological) identities. Indeed, men construct masculinities in specific social settings, however, these behaviors do not occur in vacuums. These behaviors are influenced by larger gender ideologies and social structures. And further, behaviors depend upon a man's race, class, and sexual preference. Therefore, "masculinity should be viewed as a structured action, what men do under specific constraints and varying degrees of power" (Messerschmidt, 1993, p. 81).

One of the ways in which men demonstrate masculinity is through their engagement in violent crime. This is particularly the case with men of color and lower class men. Considering that in 2007 alone, nearly 82 percent of the individuals who were arrested for violent crimes were male and 75.8 percent of persons arrested for all crimes in 2007 were male, there certainly appears to be a relationship present (Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], 2008). Messerschmidt (1993) has argued that crime is one way of performing gender and is one of the paths that men (especially those who have fewer legitimate economic opportunities) may turn to in developing, signifying, and communicating their masculinity (as cited in Rios, 2009).

Anderson (2000) asserts that many men (in particular men of color and those with lower socioeconomic standing) are expected to perform a dangerous, violent, and deviant manhood in order to gain respect from others. In addition, Pyke (1996) found that masculinity is performed differently depending on a man's class status. White men who

are in a higher socioeconomic class can demonstrate their masculinity through their ability to earn greater income and by demonstrating their power in the boardroom. Poor men have the currency of violence and survival as a means of demonstrating their masculinity. It is in this way that we see that toughness, dominance, and the willingness to engage in violence to resolve conflicts can be used to maintain masculinity. As both of these groups (Black and White working-class men) make up the two largest male majorities in prison, it is important to understand the role that violent and hegemonic masculinity plays in their lives before coming to prison (BJS, 2007c).

The messages that men internalize and reproduce from the larger culture about how men must behave sexually are pervasive (Kilmartin, 1994). Consequently, another way in which men demonstrate their masculinity is by having multiple sex partners. In order to be real men, men must have lots of sex and with lots of different sex partners (Kilmartin, 1994). As men are socialized to desire success and power, often the norm of having multiple sex partners is expressed as a demand for sexual conquest, successful sexual competition and the use of sex as a tool of power, therefore, many men view their sex lives as a way in which they can prove their masculinity (Kilmartin, 1994).

Men's sexual success is often described as "scoring," "having had her," or "I could have tapped that ass" (Kilmartin, 1994, p. 190; Peckham, 2007). Clearly, men have been acculturated to see sex and sexuality as a goal-oriented activity in which they have pursued then conquered someone, thus being a "real man" means that you have subjugated a large number of sexual partners. Consequently, the individual sexual partner

is sometimes a victim of disrespect, and is seen as an object to be used for achievement and status for the male.

Another factor to consider is that while behaviors are the most often noted elements of masculinity certain emotions are aspects of manliness as well. However, men are acculturated into expressing only two emotions: anger and sexual feelings (both of which are often considered to be out of a man's control) (Kilmartin, 1994). These appear to be the main emotions men are allowed to express without having to give an account for their feelings, consequently when factoring in the issues of sexual and violent aggression, it seems "logical" that some men would be more prone to committing sexual assault (Kilmartin, 1994).

Masculinities and Rape

There are several behaviors that conform to the doing of masculinity, but according to Kimmel (1994), two key behaviors override the others: being willing to engage in violence and being willing to engage in "sexual predation" of women. Consequently, it has been argued that a direct result of these two socially and culturally enforced gender expectations (e.g., violence and sexual predation) is rape (Messerschmidt, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997).

The overwhelming majority of research on rape focuses on women as victims. This concentrated focus is not without reason, as it appears from all available sources that women are the primary victims of sexual assault (Sanday, 1996). It has been argued that the high rates of rape in our culture are due to how men and women are socialized based on their genders (Sanday, 1996). Consequently, many feminist scholars have argued that

American society is a “rape culture” or a “rape-prone society” (Buchwald, Fletcher, & Roth, 2004; Scully, 1995; Sanday, 1996). A rape culture is one in which rape is prevalent, pervasive, sanctioned and maintained through fundamental attitudes about gender. Further, a rape culture is one that has dichotomously defined gender roles that polarize the sexes, and it demands rigid proscriptions for female and male sexuality. These rigid ideologies serve to label men as sexual subjects and women as sexual objects (Scully, 1995). Sanday (1996) argues that a “rape-prone” society is one in which violence is more prevalent, toughness and competition among males is highly emphasized, and women are held in lower regard than men (p. 26). These combine to produce a culture where men compete with each other over having sex with many women and violence may be used in conquest to win the competition (just as violence might be used in many types of conquests in order to win the competition). The concept of a rape-prone society easily translates into how some men, both in and out of prison, target others or are targeted for sexual assault.

With regards to why certain individuals become targets for sexual assault, other components of Connell’s (1987) concept of hegemonic masculinity are very useful. Connell (1987) argues that hegemonic masculinity is based on a hierarchy of sexualities with the heterosexual couple at the top. Within the heterosexual couple, the ideal is often characterized by an unequal relationship in which, the male is dominant and the female is subordinate. All other relationships Connell (1987) asserts are subordinated, and underlying these socially constructed hierarchical gender expectations are an assortment of behaviors defined as feminine or masculine. These behaviors reinforce the presumed

“natural” strength and often aggressive actions of males and “natural” weaknesses of females and feminized males. Consequently, much of the sexual violence that takes place against women and “weaker” men is meant to teach these targeted individuals and society a harsh lesson about remaining accountable to their genders, while at the same time affirming the masculinity of the offender.

Male Rape and Masculinity

Male rape is a rarely reported crime. A man who has been raped will not be seen as manly or masculine and this presents a problem in terms of reporting of rape. It is the antithesis of hegemonic masculinity to admit one has been victimized. This is one possible and likely reason why reporting rates for the crime of rape are low. Moreover, as many men are expected to be sexually predatory, reporting that one has been raped might very well be seen as a joke to law enforcement officers. In fact, because of commonly held cultural beliefs that men initiate and control their sexual encounters, society assumes that men cannot be targeted for sexual assault (Parrot & Bechhofer, 1991). Thus, the best available estimate is that 8.96 percent of all reported rapes have a male victim or one out of 33 rape victims is male (Catalano, 2004). The specific details of where the victimization took place are virtually unknown.

Very little is known about the details of male rape. Overall, what is known is that male victims are more likely to be white, college-educated men, between the ages of 18 and 39 (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1996). This is most likely due to the fact that research on male rape outside the prison environment has been consistently focused on college students who have experienced sexual coercion by women (Tewksbury & Mustaine,

2001). Nevertheless, a few studies have found data that shed some light on the experience of some male rape victims. For example, Groth and Birnbaum (1979) found in one study that men are assaulted in nearly the same places that women are: at work, at home, and on dates or other social activities. However, unlike women, men seem to be most vulnerable when they are engaged in solitary activities, hitchhiking, or most notably, in prison (Groth and Birnbaum, 1979; Scacco, 1982; McMullen, 1990; Mezey & King, 2000). In fact, two earlier studies found that most male rape victims are prison inmates (Calderwood, 1987; Lipscomb, Muran, Speck, & Mercer, 1992).

Weeks (1985) argues that masculinity is a precariously achieved state by warding off threats to this dominant gender paradigm, by rejecting femininity and homosexuality. This standard helps to explain the overriding response to male rape being that male rape evokes ideas of femininity and homosexuality. Because vulnerability is seen as a fundamental act of femininity and any sexual contact (wanted or unwanted) is associated with homosexuality, male rape is directly related to both of masculinities' subverted statuses: femininity and homosexuality. This relationship destroys a male rape victim's claim to real manhood or real masculinity. This conviction is built on the belief that real men cannot get raped either in prison or out.

Masculinities and Prison Culture

Prison culture is violent (Byrne & Stowell, 2007; Cowburn, 2007; Hensley et al. 2003). Previous scholars have argued that the levels of violence in prison are due to the extremely negative prison culture that exists in the nation's prisons. Whether the negative culture evolved as a result of violence, or the violence evolved as a result of the negative

culture has as of yet, not been definitively answered. However, there is no doubt that prison culture is linked directly to violence and disorder (Byrne & Hummer, 2008).

Further, prison culture is considered a hyper-masculine environment where men engage in the most undesirable of masculine behaviors, often in the extreme. Moreover, prison culture is one in which inmates are expected to resolve or settle disputes with violence (Toch, 1992). One earlier work asserted that the violence in prison was the result of the material and cultural deprivation the inmates suffered as the result of being isolated away from the outside world. This isolation creates a culture in which inmates are, “pushed in the direction of deviance rather than adherence to legal norms” (Sykes, 1958, p. 6). In more recent decades, this view of prison culture has been sharply questioned, indeed the notion that prisons are completely isolated social communities is now considered to be an incorrect model (Stowell & Byrne, 2008).

Empirical research has in fact, shown that, “community dynamics often extend beyond administratively segregated boundaries” (Stowell & Byrne, 2008, p. 30). Baller, Anselin, Messner, Deane, and Hawkins (2001) and Anselin, Cohen, Cook, Gorr, and Tita (2000) have also clearly established that social institutions are not social isolates and that they influence and are influenced by factors beyond their borders. When giving consideration as to the community backgrounds that many male prisoners come from and the expectations of masculinity that influence these individuals, one can see that these attitudes, behaviors, and expectations about masculinity do not arise strictly from prison culture (Anderson, 2000). However, it is important to keep in mind that prison culture is not a sum total reflection of neighborhood codes of masculine behavior, prison is a

hyper-masculine environment which “exacerbates inmates’ already pre-existing potential for violence” (Gilligan, 2000, p. 163). Further, some scholars have argued that inmates who are released export prison culture with its expectations of masculinity, back to their original communities, thereby, increasing levels of violence in these neighborhoods (Stowell & Byrne, 2008). Thus, the importation and exportation of masculinity appears to be a reciprocal relationship and not a one-directional relationship as argued by Clemmer (as cited in Fleischer & Krienert, 2006).

Male Prison Rape and Masculinity

The two groups most predominate in prison are Black and White males who have come from the aforementioned socially disorganized and impoverished neighborhoods (Harlow, 2003; West & Sable, 2007). Although Black and White men have different standards of behavior with which to demonstrate their masculinity, there are similar expectations of masculinity from men who come from these backgrounds, regardless of racial identification. Consequently, because these two groups of men are socialized to use sex and violence in order to be seen as “real men” these individuals come into the institution already prone to showing anger and engaging in violence. For these men, masculinity is often seen as survival of the angriest and the most violent. This is one way that these groups and others show dominance. It is also essential to note here that the institution of prison is not really changing these men; it is simply another location where these angry violent men must continue to illustrate their masculinity.

Accordingly, it is important to understand there are relations of dominance and subordination between men. Therefore in this theoretical framework, prison rape is not an

isolated event, it is part of a larger experience: the hierarchal ranking of prisoners in a hyper-masculine environment by how masculine they are. Though the hierarchy does not begin with the prisoners, each prisoner knows his place and the only way to maintain it is by reacting violently when challenged, therefore sexual violence is often a means to status attainment (Keys, 2002; Sabo, 2001). Consequently, there is a very sharp contrast between those at the top and those at the bottom of this hierarchy.

In prison culture, the dominant male is one who is hard, silent, stoic and ready to fight if necessary. According to Sykes and Cullen (1992), this form of inmate hegemonic masculinity has its roots in a vision of manhood that transcends the prison, indeed, traits such as toughness and loyalty are also valued in the non-incarcerated male population.

The dominant masculine men in prison who can also be considered to be “real men” are labeled “gorillas” or “wolves” (Sykes & Cullen, 1992, p. 456). “Gorillas” or “wolves” are those individuals who use violence or the threat of violence to advance and maintain their own interests and power (Sykes & Cullen, 1992). Moreover, these individuals are very prone to using rape for whatever purpose that suits their “needs.” It has been demonstrated in earlier prison research that the taking on of the wolf role can be attributed to the fierce demand in prison culture to maintain one’s masculinity (Sykes, 1958). Consequently, in order to prove their masculinity to themselves and their fellow inmates, and to avoid becoming targets themselves, wolves prey on weaker inmates. Using violence, wolves raped weaker inmates and therefore reinforced their masculinity and maintaining their high-status position in prison culture (Donaldson, 1993). They also, likely, avoided being victims themselves.

It is interesting to note that wolves or gorillas that play an active or aggressive role in the act of rape are not seen as homosexual. Indeed, as long as the offender participates in the more active role during the sexual assault (i.e., receives oral sex from their victim or penetrates the victim during forcible sodomy), or uses aggression and violence they have maintained or even enhanced their masculinity. In addition, the more aggressive the rape, the less likely they may escape being branded gay or homosexual. Thus, perpetrators who sexually assault their victims are considered straight and worthy of respect (O'Donnell, 2004). Therefore, according to these gorillas, wolves, and other inmates, they are not considered homosexual (Hensley, 2002).

At the lower end of the prison masculinities spectrum are the men who are seen as weak, feminine, or occupying a traditional feminine role. Thus, the bottom of the prison hierarchy is defined in terms of femininity. If an inmate becomes known as a snitch or a "rat" (an informant), a "fag," or a "punk," (an inmate on the receiving end of homosexual acts), a "bitch," or a "fuck-boy," (a blatant punk, someone used for sex [i.e., rape in the prison]), he is less than a man; in other words he is a woman and thus suitable for victimization just like the conquest of women in the non-institutionalized society (Martin, 2003; Sabo et al. 2001). It has been reported that in prison culture, the phrase, "make a woman out of you" means that the prisoner will be raped (Sabo, 2001, p. 64). Once these inmates are labeled or victimized they are considered to be the lowest of the low in prison culture (Hensley, 2002).

The link between masculinity and prison rape is not just relegated to the victimization of "feminine" inmates. The act of raping another inmate is considered a

masculine activity and moreover, builds “gender capital” (Mullins, 2006, p. 20). Gender capital is the concept that certain activities build masculine credibility, meaning that the more a man engages in certain activities, the more he will be viewed as manly or masculine by himself and others. According to Katz (1988), disseminating knowledge of one’s violent activities serves to build an individual’s gender capital and reputation. According to Mullins (2006), “[A] reputation by itself may serve as a form of masculine capital during social interactions, it is a resource to be spent in establishing how one man relates to another in a power hierarchy” (p. 21).

It has also been argued that male prison rape can be considered a form of what Whitehead (2005) called “exclusive violence” which is violence for the sole purpose of excluding the male victim from the category “man” because the perpetrator feels the victim is unworthy of belonging in this placement. Obviously, in the case of prison rape, this exclusive violence is characterized by sexual humiliation and by negating the victim’s masculinity. Thus “manhood” is subject to being lost at any time, and some PR offenders may feel that they must fight and rape to maintain their masculinity (Kunselman et al., 2002; Kupers, 2001). Furthermore, it is often to the prison rapist’s advantage to be seen engaging in the rape of another inmate, as this is considered masculine sex and thus it enhances his reputation as “A Man” (Donaldson, 2001, p. 123). These efforts can be seen at the other end of the spectrum as well in that men will act more masculine to avoid victimization.

A previous study found that inmates actively manage their masculinity in order to avoid being raped (Smith & Batiuk, 1989). According to these authors, a pervasive fear

of sexual assault leads to a performance which emphasizes strength and masculinity and de-emphasizes any characteristics which are considered weak or feminine (e.g., crying, being clean-shaven, not fighting back if attacked, or walking in a feminine way). These behaviors were learned in interactions with other prisoners and were socially and culturally enforced within the prison. Consequently, the inmates in their study all felt that they must eliminate entirely any behavior that could be construed as weakness or they would be at risk for rape. Most important to those inmates was to avoid any behavior which the inmates considered to be part of the female role (Smith & Batiuk, 1989).

As prisons are hierarchal and gendered institutions, inmates' reputations serve multiple functions. A less-masculine reputation may both bring-on a rape, or conversely a more masculine reputation may serve to dissuade a motivated offender from his intended target. Moreover, depending on how he is viewed by his fellow inmates, the perpetrator may be seen as more masculine. Also, contingent upon how a rape victim reacts before, during, and after the assault, he may lose or gain gender capital and thus be seen as more or less masculine. Indeed, depending on his behavior, he may subsequently no longer be seen as a man, but as a woman (which equates weakness) and therefore, he is more likely to be raped again (Chonco, 1989). Consequently, as the prison hierarchy is based on levels of masculinity that are maintained with violence and the threat of violence, it is logical to assume that the threat of violence as well as actual violence significantly contributes to the climate of fear in prison. Additionally, masculinity and the culture surrounding it is an important element in understanding the occurrence and experience of prison rape by inmates.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Masculinity Theory

Though the theory of masculinity has been written about and applied extensively, not much has been written on the strengths or weaknesses of the theory. Of the few articles which discuss these issues, the criticisms of the theory as opposed to the strengths are the focus of the discussion. Additionally, most criticisms are aimed at Connell's assertions.

The two weaknesses of Connell's theory that are highlighted the most are: although he goes to great length to describe masculinity as a configuration of practices- which subordinate women and other men, he does not define exactly which specific men's practices constitute masculinity (Martin, 1998; Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). Further, this definition tends to take the category of men as a given, rather than treating the category of men as constructed practices and the meanings given to those practices (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). The other main criticism of the theory involves the problem of pluralities. Connell (1995) is clear to state that there is masculinity but there are also multiple masculinities with the hegemonic males at the top of these hierarchal statuses of masculinities (described above). While the concept of hegemonic masculinity is an important one, it does have some weaknesses.

It has been argued that thinking of masculinities in the plural is valuable, for the simple reason that it makes one aware of the differences and inequalities among groups of men, but this concept can make it hard to see what it is that masculinities have in common, other than the physical male body (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). In addition, the multiple masculinities concept demonstrates a respect of diversity, the idea of Black

men's masculinity, gay masculinity, and other masculinities is helpful in seeing that not all masculinity is produced and reproduced alike. However, the concept is also problematic in that, implicit in the idea is that all Black or Gay men demonstrate their masculinity in the near to exact and unique way. This obviously has the effect of blurring within group differences (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009).

Another criticism to consider is that the theory of masculinities does not focus on men's agency as much as it should. In spite of masculinities being defined as a form of practice, masculinity is often invoked to explain men's behaviors. It is as if masculinity were "an independent variable that causes men to act in more or less oppressive ways" (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009, p. 281). This is tautological reasoning because if the masculine behavior is what is being examined then masculinity cannot be used to explain that self-same behavior (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009).

Despite these weaknesses, the theory of masculinity is still extremely useful and applicable to research on men and male behaviors. The theory aptly accounts for power-relations among men as well as between men and women. Here, then, it is particularly applicable to prison life and the understanding of how men engage in power relations with other men.

Masculinity theory is also useful because while it also takes into account some individual agency it also focuses on masculinity as a form of shared male behavior that has as its effect the subordination of women and other men by the most masculine of the men. For this aspect of masculinity theory, prison is an ideal setting. The prison experience is one that de-emphasizes inmates as individuals, but still gives rise to a

hierarchy of masculinity that can be achieved by the men (or groups of men) who can forcibly claim their positions the most effectively. Additionally, since prisons are single-sex, in this setting, men have only other men to dominate or to whom they are subordinate.

In addition, the theory is valuable because it gives us the concepts of hegemonic and subordinated masculinities, which enables us to see the larger societal production of masculinity (Schrock & Schwalbe, 2009). In this way, then, it also can readily be applied to prison and prison society because given the large number restrictions and rules inmates must follow, there are far fewer opportunities to solidify one's manhood than there are in the non-institutionalized society. The structural confines of prison are such that the production of hegemonic or subordinate masculinity can only occur via a few set of behaviors.

Summarily, this chapter discussed the theory of masculinity and how it relates male behaviors to the problem of aggression, violence and rape in society as well as prison. This section also discusses West and Zimmerman's (1987) Theory of Doing Gender as well as the concepts of hegemonic and subordinated masculinities and both strengths and weaknesses of this theory. Also covered are the masculine social roles in prison, the idea of gender capital and accountability, and how masculinity is socially accomplished through action and interaction. In Chapter Five, I discuss the methods and dataset for this research.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study examines factors relevant to the phenomenon of prison rape. Whereas much of the previous literature has considered the extent of PR and the factors that are associated with PR, fewer studies have examined how inmates interpret and respond to prison rape and the culture of fear and control that this crime creates in the prison environment. Further, previous research is primarily descriptive and has not elaborated on how inmates navigate their sexuality, masculinity, and identity during the prison experience. Finally, while previous research by Fleischer and Krienert (2006) extended the literature beyond the descriptive by examining and explaining prison rape within the context of a theory of culture, they did not consider the role of masculinities as they influence PR in the prison culture. It is the goal of the present research to consider these issues.

Utilizing a qualitative dataset which comprises a large set of situational and embedded cultural variables, this research focuses on increasing our understanding of the dynamics of rape and masculinity within the prison population. Given the dearth of qualitative data available on the subject of prison sexual assault, this study will broaden our knowledge base of this serious problem, as qualitative research often provides more contextual and richer data on the intimate experiences of research participants. In addition, as previous studies have been conducted with much smaller samples of inmates or with corrections officials, using this dataset with over 400 inmate interviews from 23 different prisons in 10 different states represents a significant improvement in sample size

and generalizability. This type of data will also give scholars a better picture of how prison rape affects the inmates and the overall culture of the prison.

Methods

Data and Sample

The present study utilizes the data that are a part of the dataset, “Ethno-Methodological Study of the Subculture of Prison Inmate Sexuality in the United States, 2004-2005,” which is housed at the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research. Fleisher and Krienert (2006) conducted the study in 23 men’s correctional institutions in 10 states. All 23 men’s institutions were the highest-security level men’s prisons in each state and all 23 institutions contained high-security, general population inmates (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006). Between April 2004 and September 2005, 409 males were interviewed.

In order to select a sample of general population inmates, procedures were based on practices used in classic population probability sampling, in which a systematic sample is selected using a random start and a fixed selection-interval number thereafter. First, a list was generated with all general population inmates. Then, the number of general population inmates on the institutions’ sample roster was divided by the number of subjects that could likely be interviewed in a week. A prison staff member was asked to pick a number in the range of one up to the interval number; this number was the random start number. The first subject corresponded to the inmate with that number on the sampling roster. To select the second inmate, the interval number was added to the

number of the first inmate selected. This pattern was continued until the minimum number of inmates was selected. Fifteen to twenty more inmates per institution were then added to the sample to account for refusals, transfers, medical care, and other issues that may have prevented inmates from participating. On average, two inmates per institution chose not to participate or ended the interview early. Fleisher and Krienert do not elaborate on why some inmates chose not to participate (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006). Nonetheless, an approximate 10 percent refusal rate is acceptable.

Additionally, some inmates were excluded from the sample. These were inmates identified as special category populations which included inmates in administrative detention, disciplinary segregation, hospitalized inmates, inmates in residential substance abuse units, inmates in mental health residential units or protective custody, non-sentenced inmates, inmates in transition units, and Immigration and Naturalization (INS) detainees or deportees. The study write-up does not specify why or when these inmates were excluded from the sample. These inmates might have been excluded because their residential situation was different enough that the “regular” patterns of prison life were not present for them.

Once selected, inmates were brought to the interview rooms following a predetermined set of procedures. In each of the institutions, inmates were given a pass or had been on call-out the day before the scheduled interviews. All interviews were conducted in private rooms within the institution, away from the presence of correctional officers, other staff, other inmates, or other interview rooms (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006).

These procedures were meant to ensure that their participation in the study was not known by others in the prison.

Upon selection, inmates were told by institution staff that they had been chosen for a research project. No further information was given until the informed consent procedure had taken place. The interviewers stressed that the interviews were voluntary, that inmates could refuse to answer at any time, and that the inmates had the choice to end the interview at any time without any penalty. The average interview length was just under an hour in length. The sole mode of data collection was the open-ended semi-structured interview. The interview data were collected in near-verbatim transcriptions of inmate interviews.

Based on a review of the previous literature on prison rape, Fleisher and Krienert (2006) generated a specific list of questions which were designed to examine several pre-existing themes about sexual assault in prison. According to Fleisher and Krienert (2006) previous research suggested five overarching themes about the problem of male rape in prison. First, knowledge about PR gained through direct observation or direct participation (either as perpetrator, as victim, or as witness) should be distinguished from knowledge that was acquired indirectly via word of mouth. Second, the inmates' perceptions about their environment and the issue of PR would be influenced by the information they acquired from talking with other inmates. Third, the problem of PR should cause inmates to feel threatened and worried for their personal safety. Inmates should be strongly influenced by seeing prison rape on television. Lastly, in hearing about sexual assault in prison, inmates are likely to be exposed to exaggerated tales of

sexual violence in prison and such exposure may very well influence how they see the prison environment and how safe they are in prison. Likely, inmates who hear exaggerated accounts of rape will be more fearful for their safety.

In order to gain knowledge of these themes five questions were asked of the inmates in Fleisher and Krienert's study: "First, do you know for sure of a rape in this institution or any other prison you've been in?" "Second, if you haven't seen a rape firsthand, have you heard about an inmate being raped?" "Third, are people worried about rape, is it a big threat?" "Fourth, have you ever seen a rape, like in the movies?" and "Fifth, is there rape folklore, like stories about notorious rapists of long ago?" The full list of the questions asked is in the Appendix.

Participants

The average age of the research participants is 35 years with the next largest group of inmates fitting into the 40-44 age range. In regards to race, 209 self-identified as Black, with another 127 self-identifying as White. Another 56 answered that they are Hispanic with the remaining 17 answering that they were "other." In regards to sexual orientation, 338 inmates answered that they are straight, 39 inmates asserted that they are gay, and the remaining 32 stated that they are "bisexual." The majority of offenders (258) have been imprisoned for a violent offense, with only 63 affirming that they were in prison for a non-violent offense. The remaining 88 were incarcerated for a drug-offense. For the inmates, the average amount of time in prison on their current conviction is 90.0 months or seven and a half years. In regards to prior incarcerations, over half are in prison ($n=206$) for the first time. Another 132 individuals are in prison for the second

time, 35 respondents are in prison for the third time, and 36 inmates have been in prison four or more times.³

Coding and Data Analysis Strategy

I received the raw text interviews from the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) after gaining permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Central Florida (UCF). After formatting and printing out all 409 transcripts, I comprehensively read through them. Guided in part, by the literature review on masculinity as well as prison rape, I read the transcripts looking for themes on both of these topics. Masculinity theory states that there is a hierarchy among men with heterosexual hegemonic males held in the highest regard. Thus by default, any man who does not fit into this dominant paradigm is held in lower regard, with homosexuals and other feminine men occupying the bottom status. Therefore, I expected to find that certain men were viewed as more or less masculine or not masculine at all.

The theory also states that men who are working class or are of color should be willing to engage in violence if their authority, control, or power over a situation or others is called into question. Consequently, I did expect to find similar themes as those that have appeared in previous scholarly research: men must not show weakness because in the other inmates' views, men who appear to be weaker, to be more feminine, and to be unwilling to engage in violence to defend their masculine status are viewed as less

³ I attained this information from the final report by Fleischer and Krienert (2006). Any other questions, concerns, or clarifications should be directed to the original study authors.

masculine or simply not masculine whatsoever. I also anticipated finding the themes that: men who are White and physically smaller as well as younger would also be seen as less manly. In addition, I projected the likelihood of finding that homosexual inmates would be held in much lower status than heterosexual inmates. Subsequently, then, I expected to read views that less masculine inmates were also more likely to be raped or targeted for rape.

As I read through the interviews, I highlighted themes about masculinity and prison rape. I identified themes about the topics that I expected to find as well as those that I found without specifically looking for them. I then made a list of all themes, and I created code names for them. The coding was relatively self-explanatory and interpretations of inmates' statements were not especially complex as the inmates stated very pointedly what they meant. However, when they used prison jargon, I used the book *Behind Prison Walls* by Martin and previous scholarly literature to identify key phrases and terms to translate the prison slang. A large majority of literature on prison slang has found that the terms are fairly universal in their meanings (e.g., Martin, 2003). Explanations of these slang words will be provided throughout the list of themes.

All of the 409 interview text documents were uploaded into the Atlas ti qualitative coding program. Using my list of codes and the coded transcripts, I then searched for any quotations that expressed the codes I created using the Atlas ti in-text coding feature. After I finished coding the interviews I then printed out all of the codes with their supporting quotations and began to organize them into sections that were related. For example, all quotes about homosexual inmates were grouped together by theme.

After thoroughly examining the codes and themes, I found that some of them were really quite similar. Consequently, I combined some codes with their supporting quotations. This smaller list of themes are the ones discussed in the findings chapter because there were enough similar statements to support the assertions masculinity theory makes. In contrast, some themes with their quotations were not included in the findings section, because, after reviewing the coded quotations, there were not enough similar statements made by the prisoners to support certain themes.

The first code generated “Be a Man or Be a Victim” emerges from the theory in that its most basic tenant is that masculine men must not be weak or be controlled by other men, and they must be willing to engage in violence or toughness to prove that they are not to be disrespected, victimized, or controlled by someone else. This code is illustrative of both Connell (1995) and Messerschmidt (1993) who argue that men who are considered to be masculine are willing to employ violence.

The reverse is also true: if men must be tough or violent, than demonstrating any behavior that is considered weak or soft is considered decidedly unmasculine, therefore, the quotes that contained references to this issue were coded as “Weak and Soft.” The statements for this code were similar to those for several other codes. As masculinity theory posits that there are men who are higher in status and men who are lower in status in prison, these statuses often effect whether an inmate is victimized or not.

Therefore, inmates’ comments about race, physical stature, age, and sexual orientation tended to express the same sentiments that inmates with certain statuses were seen as being weak. As such, I created codes entitled “Young, Small, White And/Or

Pretty,” “The Role Of Race,” as well as “Other Prisoner’s Views On Effeminate Inmates.” Despite the low-status that effeminate or homosexual inmates are held in, there was one element of homosexuality that appeared to be unique: there was a perception that homosexual inmates have power in the prison bureaucracy with prison staff and administration. As such, I kept this particular element of homosexuality as a separate theme which I called, “Homosexuals Have Power.”

The inmate’s views on prison rape victims, how they acted during their rape and after, and how the victim’s were labeled were also important concepts to consider. As a result, I created codes that accounted for the inmates’ views on these thoughts and behaviors. Examining how prison rape victims are assessed, viewed, and judged is important when using masculinity theory. As such I created codes to reflect the inmates’ beliefs. Statements illustrating these types of views were those like, “Become A Bitch, Fag, Or Woman, As A Result Of Rape,” “Victims Becoming Men Again,” and “They Wanted It/Allowed It/Really Are Gay.” As mentioned earlier, prison is considered to be a hyper-masculine environment and masculinity theory is quite specific on how men must behave in that, there are proscribed ways for men to act in order to be considered real men.

There is a presumption by correctional administrators that prison rape victims have options to escape their victimizers. First, in order to determine if reporting rape was considered snitching, I created a code called, “Reporting Rape Is Snitching.” Consequently, after they report their rape, they are viewed as having two choices: they

may report their assault and potentially, go into protective custody or transfer out of the prison so I created a code for these two options, "Transfer/PC Not Safe."

There was one main reason that many inmates felt was the primary motivator for some inmates sexually assault others, it is thought by many prisoners that men must have sex and if they do not have access to sex with women, they rape men, consequently, I named one code " Rape Because Need Sex" which the theory of masculinity accounts for. In addition, there were many comments befitting three other viewpoints inmates' held on prison rapists, therefore, I created three codes, "Rapists Are Powerful," "They Rape Because They Are Gay," and "They Are Hated." These codes also demonstrate the socially constructed hierarchal nature of masculinities as they place prison rapists either higher or lower in the social hierarchy.

Lastly, I created a code for the theme of "Boxing Betty (BB)" a folklore character that is mentioned in multiple interviews. BB is a mythical character who was most often described as physically large, powerful, and aggressive. Like many myths, he is believed to have really existed or people claim to have met him in his various incarnations. Masculinity theory is not designed to explain an urban prison myth, consequently, the theory cannot be applied to BB. However, this imaginary individual was mentioned enough times, that he deserved some mention. It would have been interesting to examine what this myth meant to the prisoners in terms of masculine archetypes, but, this theme was not followed up on by Fleischer and Krienert.

Issues with Secondary Qualitative Data Analysis

Though it is quite common in quantitative criminology to conduct secondary data analysis, it is not as common in qualitative research. Despite its rare application, this methodology is quite useful. Scholars have four reasons for or approaches to the use of secondary qualitative data analysis:

1. Using a different unit of analysis to guide analyses.
2. Using the sample to extract a sub-set of cases for a more focused study of the original subject matter.
3. Reanalysis concerned with exploring a concept present but unexplored in prior analysis.
4. Using the data set as a basis for the refinement of data collection (Hinds, Vogel, and Clarke-Steffen, 1997).

The present study builds on the third approach as Fleischer and Krienert looked at prison culture and prisonization while I consider the more specific theoretical elements of masculinity and sexuality.

Despite the rich findings in this research, utilizing secondary qualitative data is not without its limitations. There are several general methodological issues that arise when conducting a secondary analysis of qualitative data: the degree to which the generated data was open to a secondary analysis and the extent to which the research purpose of the secondary analysis differs from the earlier research (Hinds, Vogel, Clarke-Steffen, 1997). Here, these two issues are less problematic. I had access to the complete transcriptions for all interviews, with no information blinded. Plus, my examination of

the data, while unique and divergent from the researcher's original purpose is compatible, not contrary to it. Another issue with secondary qualitative data is the loss of the contextual meaning of the data. As I was not present at the time of the interviews, it is entirely possible that the inmates' remarks meant something slightly different than what I interpreted from the transcripts. However, taken as a whole, I believe that the masculine contextual meanings have been largely preserved.

In this research, I have reanalyzed the data in order to examine a concept present, but unexplored in the prior study. As I reviewed the primary study, I noticed that the respondents discussed masculinity and its many accompanying issues and yet, Fleischer and Krienert did not focus on these concepts, especially in how they relate to sexual violence in prison and the hierarchal status of the inmates. Moreover, the earlier research utilizing Clemmer's theory of culture, argues that inmate knowledge is acquired primarily through speech and secondarily through observation in prison. Hence, the theory asserts that what inmates know about prison violence is derived from hearing about it and not actually witnessing it (Fleisher & Krienert, 2006). I focus less on how they learn about prison rape, and more on how they interpret it, particularly with regard to their views on masculinity, violence, and sexuality and how these relate to prison rape. In doing so, I also argue that PR is not a product of "prisonization" but stems from the masculine socialization men receive as members of society. As I am using a different theory to explain the reasons for inmate violent and sexual behavior as well as a different focus (how inmates interpret prison rape, not how they learn about it), this research and

reexamination of the data significantly differ from the original study. Next, Chapter Six presents my findings from my reexamination of these data.

CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS

This chapter discusses the major themes that emerged from my analysis of the data, and it explores what these themes mean in the context of prison rape and masculinity. Table 1 notes these themes and the amount of times inmates made comments that corresponded with each theme. It is important to note that what I have reported here is the verbatim, the literal translation in the dataset if I added any emphasis, I have noted it. In order to keep track of the inmates' comments, each inmate will be identified by a number that corresponds to his interview. For example, if an inmate's interview was number six, then the inmate will be identified as "Inmate 6" or "I6."

Be a Man or Be a Victim

One overriding theme immediately became apparent and appeared to influence all subsequent views on masculinity in prison: A man must not be weak, appear weak, or show weakness of any kind. Inmate 200 illustrated this with his comments,

You carry yourself like a man and you'll get respect like a man, but if you carry yourself girlish, dudes going to feed off of that. A man got to do what a man got to do. If someone disrespect you, you got to stand up to that.⁴

Here, this inmate is suggesting that harm will befall any inmate who does not stand up to others and be a man. Inmate 170's remarks also support this dominant theme, "We fight and we show no signs of weakness and you know how to take care of yourself. Prison is

⁴ This phrase means that an inmate must defend their masculine reputation with violence if necessary.

Table 1

Theoretical Themes and Frequency Inmates Mentioned Them

| Theme | Number of times mentioned (out of 409 interviews) |
|---|--|
| Be a Man or Be a Victim | 73 |
| Weak & Soft | 72 |
| Young, Small, White, and/or Pretty | 85 |
| The Role of Race | 75 |
| Other Prisoner's Views on Effeminate Inmates | 125 |
| Homosexuals Have Power | 64 |
| Became a Bitch, Fag, or Woman as Result of Rape | 50 |
| Victims Becoming Men Again | 51 |
| They Wanted/Allowed It/Really are Gay | 166 |
| Reporting Rape is Snitching | 34 |
| Transfer/PC not Safe | 47 |
| Rape Because Need Sex | 59 |
| Rapists are Powerful | 87 |
| They Rape Because They Are Gay | 103 |
| They are Hated | 66 |
| Boxing Betty | 53 |

full of sharks...and is a shark pond.” Again, we see that inmates believe that they must be physically aggressive, or they will have serious problems while they are in prison.

Following in this theme are the comments of Inmate 260, “You don’t send out no signs of weakness no female tendencies none of that...just keep your masculinity in check.” This statement clearly implies that there are behaviors that are considered feminine and masculine, and these inmates’ comments illustrate a belief that acting masculine (i.e., not appearing weak which equates femininity) will gain them respect from their fellow inmates and will help them avoid any victimization.

The inmates in this study define several behaviors as masculine or as befitting manly behavior. Acts of violence such as fighting back against any perceived threat, or other acts of aggression are considered worthy masculine responses to a dangerous situation. For example, Inmate 160 stated,

You gotta stand up on your own two feet, if it means you got to shank somebody, then you handle your business, if it means you got to box somebody, you handle your business, and if you run with some people and they get into a riot, you get into a riot too.

Continuing on in this theme, Inmate 329 said, “Be aggressive. Stand up, if you violently express your feeling, it’s the only way.” These quotes exemplify the expectations that the prisoners have about masculinity: that masculine men fight and guard their reputations (and those of their “people”) with physical aggression. Additionally, these expectations clearly influence how inmates’ think other inmates should react to perceived threats: their reactions must be the use of violence—no other strategies are acceptable.

Being masculine not only preserves one’s reputation, but it also helps one avoid victimization. It appears from these interviews that inmates hold the conviction that the only way to avoid becoming a target for rape is to be willing to engage in violence, to be

willing to act tough, or to be willing to act in a more masculine fashion. Inmate 17 related the following experience:

I was in the chow hall and my dudes was right there with me and a Black dude was sitting on the chair and whistling at me, one of my dudes called me and said this dude whistling at you. I went to the dude and said, 'You whistling at me or something?' and we got into it right there. I told him, 'Dude you ain't fucking with no punk' You gotta show your self-respect. He would have kept coming at me every day if I hadn't done anything. He would have had me.

Other inmates echoed these beliefs, Inmate 400 stated, "You have to use violence and wear a mask, looking tough." This thought was followed up by several inmates who gave these responses after being prompted about ways inmates try to prevent being raped, "Emphasize their manhood instead of soft-side of themselves, manhood-macho tough image" (I409). One inmate asserted, "Put up a front, like they're really Arnold S. types" (I144). Inmate 254 summed up these beliefs by claiming, "Walk around like 'I have respect for myself.' I'll come back and bash your head with a brick." This theme was also echoed by Inmate 277, "If someone ever approached me, I would tell them, 'I don't walk like a girl, my daddy had four sons, you want to continue with this, one of us is going to heaven.' " Here, we see that being willing to be tough and being willing (perhaps even eager) to use violence in defense of manhood is a critical aspect of masculinity. Indeed, not having these characteristics puts an inmate in serious jeopardy. Further, masculinity is important in prison because it earns one the respect of others, as well as avoiding victimization.

Weak and Soft

In stark contrast, should an inmate be seen as demonstrating behaviors that are not violent or in line with what is considered masculine behavior, they would likely be categorized by their fellow inmates in several highly negative ways and these labels would likely lead to an attempted or completed sexual assault. First, they are often seen as weak and soft, which in prison means they are demonstrating feminine behavior (e.g., Dumond, 1992). For example, in response to the question, who is more likely to be targeted for rape, Inmate 19 stated “Weak guys, new guys, experience does not mean anything, if they spot feminine ways in you, they will try it,”⁵ Continuing on with this idea, Inmate 2 answered the same question, “Everybody’s not strong, though, I think the people with feminine qualities, they might have to look over their shoulders, they’d have to watch over themselves.” As being masculine is equated with being strong and being in control of a situation, an inmate who does not demonstrate these behaviors is seen as feminine and, therefore is weaker than manly men. Further, it is clear from these comments that being seen as feminine is seen as undesirable. This thought is consistent with the idea of a male hierarchy in the theory of masculinity where some men are held in higher or lower status than others. These statements also indicate that being seen as weak and soft could place one in serious danger. Taken with the comments above (representing “Be a Man or Be a Victim”), these inmates seem to imply that since one of the only ways masculine men have to illustrate their manliness is to use violence and physical aggression, they are likely to be looking for inmates to prey on or physically dominate.

⁵ It means rape in this context.

As such, inmates who are weak and soft will be easy targets for the multitude of manly prisoners actively looking for opportunities to illustrate and solidify their masculine status.

Young, Small, White and/or Pretty

In addition to demonstrating the feminine qualities of weakness, men who are young, White, and smaller in stature are also seen as soft and more feminine, therefore they are more likely to be sexually assaulted. Inmate 16 calls them, “little White guys (LWGs) that the littlest thing in the joint.” This theme of LWGs being prime targets was repeated in 79 of the interviews. For example, Inmate 17 stated, “They like really young guys, they look for the young meat you know,” this sentiment was also asserted by inmate 18 in response to the question, “Who is more vulnerable to rape?, he answered, “petite, White, no facial hair.” Inmate 176 confirmed this theme as well, “The young White people, this is the group having most problems in the system. Most young White people are gonna be in trouble.” Inmate 37 summed it up in his statement, “You’re more vulnerable if you’re really young and don’t have a strong mentality, if you’re feminine in any environment. They see that as less, you’re not equal in any measure.” Clearly here, some inmates equate a smaller physical stature, a lack of facial hair, and youth as weakness which according to masculinity theory means that they occupy the lowest rung of the masculine ladder. Their position, therefore, leaves them open to domination by the men who are higher up in the prison hierarchy, and looking for ways to make sure they stay higher up in the prison hierarchy. Here, we see that many inmates see these smaller

and weaker prisoners as being feminine and therefore, vulnerable to prison rape by the more masculine inmates.

Physical attractiveness or being “pretty” regardless of race is also seen as more feminine in prison culture. Inmate 246 clarified these claims, “See White guys coming and baby-faced looking and they go after them. Hispanics come in looking like little kids and to them they look like little girls.” The remarks of Inmate 65 echo these ideas, “Even little Blacks look like punks with their pants down their ass, ‘How much do you want for a pound of *that* shit (emphasis mine).” “Little White boys don’t last too long, little Black boys don’t last too long for that matter “(I260). Inmate 23 asserted, “An inmate who looks like Leonardo DiCaprio in Titanic or Lorenzo Tate” is more vulnerable to rape As Leonardo DiCaprio is White and Lorenzo Tate is Black it seems men who are more feminine looking or who are physically attractive are more likely to be targeted for rape regardless of other characteristics they possess. Inmate 37 commented, “If you’re feminine (or pretty)...they see that as less, you’re not equal in any measure.” These comments illustrate how being perceived as pretty, and consequently, more feminine regardless of race is an important concept in the targeting of potential victims. In the highly predatory prison environment, those who are higher up on the social ladder can only be “higher” when there are inmates who are “lower.” As such, the more masculine prisoners need to physically dominate less masculine prisoners so as to maintain not only their statuses, but the hegemonic social structure. This is yet another example of how lower-status men are seen as occupying a female role. Here their lower statuses are based on physical appearance (age, skin, attractiveness, stature), rather than demeanor (how

effeminate they are, how strong they are) but that lower status has the same consequences: physical danger and likely victimization.

The Role of Race

Another aspect of hierarchal masculinity regards race (Connell, 1995). Just as racial heritage influences one's position in the social hierarchy of society, so too, does it contribute to the social ladder in prison. To elaborate, inmates often use stereotypes when they assign negative views about members of certain races and evaluate them as more or less masculine and deserving of respect. For example, to be targeted for PR, an inmate does not have to be only seen as weak, indeed, he can just be White because of the stereotypical connotations inmates have about Whites. Several inmates in this study mentioned this phenomenon, "It is mostly White guys that are manipulated, most of them are targeted (I33). Following up this thought, Inmate 61 stated, "Whites is the lowest in here, the Blacks and the Mexicans have hate towards the White." Another inmate (I149) affirmed, "Seen guys who are 50 getting raped, especially Whites, Whites are a minority." Additionally, "Whites come in and they get treated worse than anybody, they get checked when they get here" (I161). Whites are targeted for sexual violence because they are seen as less tough and less manly. Race relates to the theory of masculinity in that, Whites are considered to occupy the lowest status on the prison social ladder, they are subordinate and are therefore more likely to be victimized.

It appears the main reason is that Whites are seen as more worthy victims is because they have experienced fewer hardships in life and have not had to be so tough. Inmates believe that Whites have grown up in different environments than Blacks, and

these perceived differences in life experiences make them prime targets for rape, “Black kids are in some kind of gang and come in and know people, White boys grow up in a stable home” (I45). Other inmates’ comments support this assertion, “Blacks are known to fight better than White guys” (Inmate 70). Continuing on, Inmate 108 reported, “A lot of the time they say Blacks and Mexicans run it so they think a White person is more weak.” Other inmates felt this way as well, “If you are White that raises your risk and you just looking weak” (Inmate 140). Another inmate claimed this as well, “Whites are weakest and most attractive for rape” (I147). “People feel like the White boys are weak so they pick on them” (Inmate 167). Another comment that illustrates this issue clearly is from Inmate 310,

Well truthfully, Caucasian race are more likely to get raped than a Black person, the livelihood Black people come out of, they ain’t gonna stand for it, the others have a mental thing, they can’t really think for themselves or for survival.

Here then, race is seen by inmates as a characteristic that has tremendous importance for one’s position in the prison social hierarchy. Simply being White carries stereotypical connotations and stigmas that translate back to issues of masculinity. Since Whites have not had to be tough on the outside of prison, they are not going to be able to handle the predatory nature of prison life, nor will they be able to respond to affronts with the appropriate behavior: violence. As such, they are not real men and are worthy prey for tough Blacks who are solidifying their higher position on the social ladder. This notion of the stronger race (Blacks) preying on the weaker race (Whites) is consistent with masculinity theory.

Other Prisoner's Views on Effeminate Inmates

Masculinity is also determined based on observed behavior. The inmates did not always elaborate on whether race, attractiveness, or other such characteristics were important traits of targeted inmates, indeed, they simply asserted that the potential victim was acting or carrying himself in a feminine manner. "A lot of it's how you carry yourself. If you got a guy who's real feminine and tried to show his body off he's more likely to get raped" (I312). Inmate 166 also stated this belief, "By the way they carry themselves, some dudes in here are more feminine than others." This concept was echoed by other inmates, "You may have features of a girls, feminine ways, the way you carry yourself" (I232). Inmate 213, "Some of them the way they look or carry themselves...the victim looks like a woman, has feminine ways and stuff." Inmate 234 comments reflect this conviction, "The way you walk. When you walk you got to be conscious of everything, there are guys who walk feminine." Further, according to some inmates, acting like women or behaving in feminine ways are signs of weakness and therefore, victims are asking for it. The comments of Inmate 17 are particularly compelling, "They watch him and if the dude carries himself like a woman...they try to rape him, if you carry yourself like a woman, come on now." There are other inmates who expressed these values as well, "The way they act, the way they carry themselves, they leave themselves wide open" (Inmate 239). One inmate was very succinct, "They asked for it, way they carry themselves" (Inmate 257). These comments reflect the certainty that inmates who give off feminine impressions or who carry themselves in more feminine ways are far more likely to be victimized. Further, this nebulous concept of "acting feminine" is

somehow understood and agreed upon by inmates, such that those inmates who are “feminine” are lower on the social ladder. To be sure, inmates of this sort can actually be blamed for their assaults, because all inmates know what the consequences are for acting feminine. As such, it becomes clear that there are definite gender distinctions that mark the prison social hierarchy, much like the gender distinctions that characterize the non-institutionalized social hierarchy: men are higher up in the social system, deserving of more respect, and are given more leeway to act as they see necessary to maintain their dominance, while women are lower on the social ladder, given less respect, and often blamed for their subsequent misfortunes. Continuing, it appears as if the inmates believe that impressions are important in other ways. According to some inmates, if another inmate acts gay or like a homosexual, they brought their rape on themselves. “They observe them. They look for homosexual tendencies, they spot them out and find out whether they walk or talk like that” (Inmate 270). Another inmate also expressed this idea, “If he shows that he’s gay, then they’re going to come at you” (I239). The remarks of Inmate 279 are particularly enlightening, “First of all, like I said, I wouldn’t put myself in that position. I wouldn’t walk around like I had gay tendencies.” Another inmate agreed with this prison value, “Those who get raped place themselves in that situation (Inmate 333). One inmate felt, “They look for someone they think is asking for it, acting feminine” (Inmate 260). Inmate 260’s statements also illustrate this notion:

I guess they display them kind of qualities. I feel like you only going to get treated a certain way if you act a certain way. You’ll only attract that kind of attention if you display those qualities. No one ever came at me and said they’d rape me.

Further, Inmate 279's comments also demonstrate this perspective:

I believe from what I seen being raped and being a target for being raped is if you carry yourself in a way that you would draw and attract predators to you. By flaunting your butt, shaving all the hair off your face, trying to look like a woman. You give guys clues right there as to what you are. Somebody going to come and make a move on you.

One inmate found the whole idea of an inmate being raped laughable, "I don't mean to laugh (laughing) [it is] because they're weak, they act gay, that's about it" (I316). These comments illustrate a lack of respect for less masculine victims, and they reemphasize that men who are lower in the prison social hierarchy (those who act feminine or gay) are more likely to be targeted for sexual victimization and then blamed for their plight. Further, the inmates again suggest that the more masculine prisoners must rape in order to continue to show they are masculine. When they do so, they look for easy prey, not other masculine inmates to sexually and/or violently dominate.

Homosexuals Have Power

Views on homosexuals appeared be confounding, in that, despite the low status that inmates perceived to be gay occupy, they are also seen by some inmates as having power in the prison. According to these inmates there are several reasons as to why homosexuals have power in the institution, the first one is that homosexuals are seen as individuals who can get stuff done, the second one is they are seen as being well-liked by the female and other staff at the prisons, and the third one is that they are liked by the prison administration because they are more likely to snitch.

As an example, Inmate 401 commented on the perceived effectiveness of homosexual inmates, "A lot of clerks are homosexuals and can get things done. They had

power, which means they had a juice card and get things done.” Another inmate stated, “The girls have learned to use their influence of who they are to get things done” (I117).⁶ Inmate 207 also believed this as well, “They get little things done, the real homos get things done.” In addition to getting things done, homosexual inmates are perceived as being friendly with prison staff. Inmate 362 stated, “It’s just because of the way they get along with people, if somebody is all nice to you and don’t give you no problems and then you have some asshole, you give the nice guy favors.” However, gay inmates are viewed as able to get along with female staff in particular, “A lot of times homosexuals can communicate better with women” (I260). Inmate 259 also illustrated this notion with his comments, “They have pull with CO women, they a non-threat, he want no pussy, he want dick the same thing she want, they feel comfortable around them.” Another inmate thought that females trust gay inmates because “he’s been here awhile” (I335). Inmate 301 felt it was because, “He can talk with a female staff and they can click.” Inmate 310 remarked on how gay inmates appear to get along with female staff, “A female can think highly of you, they question the homosexuals about straight guys, if he gay or not, they libel to tell anything they know.” The other reason that homosexuals are seen as having power is because they are thought to be snitches. Inmate 368 commented, “Some of them have power with the police, for some reason they be liking the homosexual. I guess cause they tell if they want to know something,” as did Inmate 223, “See people here like homosexual cause they rat. They rat about drugs and we ain’t gonna have stuff, they have a lot of people that tell something.” Other inmates felt this as well, “I will put it like this

⁶ Here the term “girls” refers to gay inmates (Martin, 2003).

the people with the most power are the informers, they constantly inform the security for little favors. They are the favorites. The most informers are homosexual and gay people. They come to jail and they tell to get what they want” (I227). Inmate 210 clearly stated, “Yeah, they rats. They tell security anything they want to know.”

This is an interesting dichotomy as homosexuals are certainly not seen as real men by inmates, yet because of their special relationship with prison staff and administration, their position on the prison social hierarchy may not be as low as it could be and they are perceived to have power in the prison. Although, it is important to point out that the power they have is not gained through typical masculine activities either in prison or out, with the exception of being able to “get things done.” It is perhaps their competence, rather than their willingness to be tough and use violence that increases their status somewhat. Thus, even though some these inmates are seen as having achieved power, they are still seen as less worthy than the hegemonic men.

Became a Bitch, Fag, or Woman as a Result of Rape

Although many inmates try to avoid becoming sexual assault victims, some are not successful. Should an inmate become a victim of rape, their status as “a man” may change depending on the action they take after the sexual assault. Indeed, some inmates are no longer seen as men; in fact, they are considered bitches, fags, punks, or women all of which are extremely derogative terms that clearly indicate that individuals who are labeled with these words are not considered to be men or male. Further, these labels are used to identify someone who is considered to be the most despised or pathetically weak within the prison hierarchy (see Martin, 2008). In addition, for some men, once they are

victimized they may be considered the female property of their rapist. Further, if they do not fight back, they will often be a repeated target for rape.

Many inmates view the victim as no longer a man, but what is more compelling is that in some cases, the victim himself also changes his gender. Inmate 1,

If don't lock up after a rape, they become a bitch, next thing you know they're out walking around talking high. And they'll end up moving in with that person. It was involuntary the first time, they figure they're stigmatized now: What the hell. I've seen fags sold, bought, rented.

Inmate 10 asserted:

They will become somebody's boy quickly...The man sets the rules, the boy no longer has the rights to do anything. Once they are somebody's boy, the boy has to do everything they tells you, or he'll get beat down. All his commissary goes to the man, everything he does, who he can talk to, what he wears.

In response to the question, "How is the victim of a rape viewed?" Inmate 34 succinctly answered, "They look at them as a punk or a bitch." Another inmate's comments illustrate this prison value, "Once you get penetrated you are, you lost your virginity once you break the backdoor the manhood you no longer a man anymore" (I2). Inmate 7 asserted,

I only seen one dude who got raped since I been down here on this bit, he was an all out female fag after it happened...This guy was White and he wasn't a fag before the rape but he was after.

Another inmate (I276) echoed this sentiment:

A lot of guys I done seen, afterwards they shell shocked but then they just turn to their more feminine side and accept it. Turn into the girl and they're a man's wife and they take care of that man after that.

Inmate 32's observations are particularly informative, "My friend came to prison and he was handsome. Prison made him gay. His manhood was taken. He was raped and he

decided he liked it.” Another inmate remarked, “Some people turn to the homosexual life and that is all they know and they stay that way and it messes their head up” (I137). One inmate (I144) shared his own experience of changing sexual preferences after his rape,

Rape changes a man’s life. I wasn’t bisexual or gay before I came to prison. Now, in here, if they want to come in and take me again, I say just come on in here, one at a time and take care of your business.

Another inmate recalled a similar situation from a bystander’s perspective (I166):

They brought a young White guy to this unit on a medium custody and this Black guy that was into homosexuality a lot he saw the White guy and he said he was ugly but he called him a young tender. He actually just physically drug him into the White guys’ cell and raped him in there and the White guy didn’t report it. He just got shipped out but until he left here he was just considered a homosexual and he lived like that from that point on, he started having sex with a bunch of men, not cause he wanted to but out of fear.

Masculinity theory is clear in arguing that there are specific behaviors than men must engage in to be seen as men (e.g., being in control, having multiple female sexual partners). With this sample, it appears that the socialization of masculinity is so strong that even victims who are raped believe the consequences of their victimization (that they are no longer “men”). It is obvious from these comments that some raped inmates, no longer consider themselves to be men then subsequently, they demonstrate actions and behaviors that are equated with being female. This process of self-identification and change is consistent with West and Zimmerman’s (1987) theory of “Doing Gender.” When men are raped their self-identification changes to female, and they begin to take on female behaviors.

Even if the victim does not take on the role of being bisexual or homosexual, according to many inmates he will be viewed as such. This viewpoint is dependent on the

rape victims' actions before and after the assault. Should an inmate decide not to go into protective custody (i.e. lock-up), then other inmates often see him as a different gender or as a valid repeat target for sexual assault, Inmate 18's comments illustrate this notion:

If a guy was raped and he didn't retaliate for it, it was over for him, he would be a punk from then on, there wouldn't have to be any more rape. Once he's been taken and is a punk, there is no more rape. He's already a punk.⁷

Other inmates' statements show this perspective, "If a dude gets raped in here and he doesn't like that stuff and he don't retaliate then he's looked at like, 'Damn! What's wrong with you?'" (I2). I217 remarked, "They going to be a homosexual, once the word gets out" Other inmates feel this way, "He's a bitch" (I251). "Most of the time they become a woman" (I255). I12 also commented, "We also call them she in here, they are not a he, once you lose your manhood that's it." And to clarify the assertion that they are a valid repeat target here are some other inmates' comments, "He's a fuck boy, fucked all the time" (I259). "Just labeled man, he's a fuck boy...he's faggy" claimed inmate 259. Inmate 265 also stated this belief, "Talking about someone who gets their manhood taken, I guess he gets to be a hooker or a prostitute...he be everybody's."

This theme of repeated victimization is an all pervasive one. Many inmates commented on the victim's having wanted it or becoming a punk if they do not fight back. However, it is important to note that the rape victim is seen as no longer being a victim after the first assault. Inmate 16 stated, "They just accepted it, the rape that leaves the door open for them to be raped again then." "They keep getting raped, but it would not be rape after the first time" were the thoughts of Inmate 26. Indeed, it is no longer

⁷ This comment indicates that inmates would still have sex with the punk, it would just no longer be considered rape.

considered rape because the inmate has been relegated to fag or punk status. “It shows that maybe he likes it or want to choose somebody. He’s not a target, he’s a punk, you can’t target a punk, he’s already done it” (I18). This thought is continued on with Inmate 232’s statement, “Once you get raped and don’t do nothing about it, you have accepted it, it won’t be rape no more.” Another inmate (347) declared, “He’d get punked you know, either be punked off the yard, pussy or dick sucker that kind of thing.” Theoretically, these sentiments are consistent with masculinity theory in that, after a rape, an inmate’s status further lowered, unless he begins to act like a man. Then, due to his lowered status he is at risk for further sexual dominance.

It is important to understand, the victim is expected to become someone’s boy if they do not “lock-up” or fight back. Otherwise, he will continue to be raped by multiple assailants instead of just one. One inmate stated, “Keep on getting raped by various people, until the victim decides to be someone’s boy when they get tired of being raped” (I23). They’ll make him ride, he has to get with somebody” (I113). The comments of Inmate 208 are also illuminating, “Well you will continue to be, the person who raped you will claim you to be your homosexual companion. If he don’t claim you, you will be bouncing from one inmate to another one.” Another inmate affirmed this belief, “He is going to keep getting raped so may just go on and keep playing woman’s role. Dudes say, if he did it and didn’t tell, others will do it and eventually he’ll pick one for his daddy” (I337). So here, unless the inmate fully accepts his new feminine label, he will be dominated by “real me” over and over again.

Interestingly, many inmates believe that a raped inmate is turned gay by their assault, “If they weren’t already gay they’ll become gay at least for the time they are incarcerated” (I166). Inmate 85 “Some get raped and become gay...raped guys are feminine anyway.” However, if an inmate responds in the “proper way” they may gain back their masculinity or manhood.

If an inmate fights back or engages in retaliatory behavior which is meant to result in the death of his attackers he can regain his lost manly status. But again, it is important to remember that if an inmate does nothing they will be branded a homosexual. “If you are gang raped and you fight you are not a homosexual. “If you are raped by one individual and accepted it that makes you homosexual. If he accept it then that is what he wanted” (I226). Some inmates understand that fighting back may come with a price so to speak,

They get raped because they be fighting back, and got the eye busted and affects the manhood, they resist and its rape if they don’t give in. If they give in its not, but will get hurt if they don’t give in. (I2)

Inmate 220 also echoed these beliefs:

They have to stay a homosexual. The only way to ever get out of that jacket is to stud up and handle their business and prove to anybody that that’s their man now. The guy has to let him stud up if he doesn’t want to let him stud up he has to fight until people decide he prove himself.

Of course it may be that inmates who partner up with their aggressor, or who appear to become someone’s fag or turn homosexual are really just attempting to live through a continually harrowing experience. These inmates may feel that the only way to survive prison is to have sex with one person over having sex with many, or having sex willingly so that they are not continually physically injured. Nevertheless, other inmates

believe that these individuals begin to like it and continue to have sex willingly. This view is adherent to masculinity theory which applied in this type of case posits that men who are lower on the social hierarchy learn and accept their place in it. Here, it is likely that similar the social hierarchy on the outside, both those inmates who are higher or lower in the pecking order believe in its appropriateness and behave accordingly.

Victims Becoming Men Again

Fighting and being willing to fight was another theme echoed by inmates. Most inmates felt that the victim needed to fight in some way. Inmate 80's comments confirmed this commonly held prison value, "You got to stand up for yourself. It is like sharks and blood, you just got to fight once and they can avoid it in the future." Another inmate echoed this idea as well, "Depends on how you carry yourself. 'Cause say three guys ran ya, and you came out fighting, it ain't gonna happen again" (I133). Inmate 153 also declared, "To recover rep, you gotta put your fist in his mouth, even if they knock you out. That's what they look at, if you stand up for yourself."

Inmate 189's comments further illustrate this notion:

It's according to how this person, did he accept it or not or did he try and retaliate on that person in any way? If he didn't try to retaliate, then he'll get a reputation as a person who accepted it. He'll be a pressure punk 'cause he's forced into participating into homosexual activity. If he fought back then his reputation as a man can still stand. If he tried to take some retaliation or tried to show he didn't want to participate you know.

Inmate 237 also confirmed these commonly held prison values: "If you lay there and do nothing you're a punk, if you go out in the yard and kill them no one will bother you, you know."

As did Inmate 226:

It depends on how he reacts. Accepts it more and more will come. That means he accepts what happens and other guys will go after him. Then it would be a form of him fighting for his manhood. That would mean he is not accepting it and will be a man.

The comments of Inmate 260 succinctly sum up the general attitude of many of the research participants:

In prison the only thing you got is your respect, your reputation, and your manhood, you can only give them away, no one can take them from you. If a person get raped and handled their business after the fact, they still show that they a man.

These comments are completely in line with the assertions of masculinity theory, being tough and being willing to fight (or kill) is the key to being a man, yet, if something unfortunate happens, these same qualities may allow an inmate to regain his manhood. Of course regaining one's manhood is essential or one risks ongoing victimization.

As stated above, men who are raped can regain their masculine status but for those that are not able to, they are held in the very lowest regard by their fellow prisoners. Inmate 18's comments are particularly illuminating, "He'd be treated as a pressure punk, everybody would know he's been turned out...we wouldn't piss on him if he was on fire." Inmate 45 affirmed these thoughts as well, "Damaged, he's through, he'll never be anybody," as did Inmate 44, "Victim is a pussy, couldn't take care of himself." Another inmate commented, "Weak, considered a ho or a whore, someone who needs to be seen and not heard. No respect, all respect is gone" (I117). Another example of this attitude is demonstrated by the comments of Inmate 220, "He's a whore, he's weak, a pussy." Clearly, failing to respond to disrespect as a "real man" is contemptible and seemingly,

without any possibility of masculine redemption. Here we likely have someone who is viewed by other inmates as the lowest of the low: they became a victim, which is bad enough in itself, but they did not even respond as a “man” would to an affront, which is also bad enough in itself. Put the two together and the inmate has no redeeming masculine characteristics.

They Wanted It/Allowed It/Really Are Gay

So pervasive is the belief that rape is really just consensual gay sex that some prisoners deny that sexual assault even occurs, in spite of many of them describing horrific accounts of sexual violence. Inmate 37 recounted an incident he had heard about from his friend, “I have a friend who was gay, so not really rape, they put a broomstick up in him because he owed them money.” One inmate recounted the story of another inmate who attempted suicide, “I know one person that tried to, in fact, he wasn’t raped, he was made to perform oral sex on another inmate” (I232). Moreover, some inmates believe that any sexual encounter between two men is consensual. Inmate 301 asserted, “I didn’t witness rape, I witnessed a sexual transaction between a man and I turned my head like I didn’t see it. It’s disgusting.” Whereas others argue that rape does not exist, some inmates argue only certain acts constitute sexual assault, “Giving head isn’t rape ORAL SEX IS NOT RAPE, IT IS ALWAYS VOLUNTARY, I don’t see a guy forced to have sex through the mouth. Only one way to have rape” (I44).

Further, many inmates argue that the victim was not really raped, they in fact, wanted it even if the victim has stated differently. Inmate 43’s comments reflect these beliefs, “Most time it ain’t against their will, they say they get raped, but it’s their own

doing, they want to get it done to them, they want to do it.” Inmate 379, “I guess they want it. I don’t want to say they want it, they’re into that lifestyle, I don’t think it’s really getting raped, there is a lot of homosexual activity going on, so I guess you can say they want it.” Inmate 300 echoed these thoughts in his statement, “Because they want to, there is no prison rape, I’ve never heard of anything like that. Lots of guys are willing to give it up,” as did Inmate 51, “Nowadays, the only raping going on is ‘cause you want it. If you want them to fuck you, they will.” Inmate 246 asserted, “Men don’t actually get raped, they want it, but don’t want it the way they received it.” Other inmates have argued that rape is a voluntary activity, “Guys aren’t getting raped, guys are volunteering. I wouldn’t call it rape” (I274). “You keep saying rape, but you have dudes that’s voluntarily fucking and stuff too” (I259). Inmate 344 stated, “I wouldn’t necessarily say they get raped, I would say it’s voluntary,” as did Inmate 277, “It does not happen, everything is voluntary.” Inmate 104 comments also affirm this belief, “I don’t consider it rape, I consider it volunteers that want to do sexual things. Inmate 146 asserted this as well, “Guys like it, freaks, Dudes put themselves out to get raped.” Respondent 38, “You can’t rape the willing and if it’s a cozy situation that’s what will happen, it’s really not rape, they’re both consenting.” Inmate 16’s comments also support this notion, “I don’t believe you could be raped down here, you have to already be a homosexual.” Inmate 45 also affirmed this belief, “Can’t rape the willing, once a fag always a fag.” Some inmates reacted with anger at the thought of rape, “No inmate be getting raped! Damn, they was already gay when they came here, that’s a bunch of lies.” (I351). Another inmate also argued for this viewpoint, “Wanna be raped motherfucker, knew they was a faggot but

tried to hide it. Like a dude knows he's a faggot but gets married and still fucks men" (272).

From these remarks, we see victim-blaming in the extreme. It is plain that many inmates do not believe in the idea that a real man can be a victim, no indeed, if a man is raped he must be gay, and he must have wanted it. These thoughts speak volumes about how some heterosexual inmates view gays and gay sexuality (if there is such a thing). Moreover, they speak to the idea that a heterosexual man who is a real man cannot be raped and if he asserts that he has been victimized he is in fact, gay, and therefore, his "real man" status is gone. Presumably, gay men always want sex, want it to be violent sex, and if they claim that they have been raped, they are lying. This is compelling given that many female rape victims in general society often experience the same problem: They must have really wanted it and if they claim otherwise they are lying.

Whether or not the victimization is seen as voluntary, it appears as if an inmate has little to no opportunity to escape their attackers or their damaged reputation, furthermore if they report their victimization, they may be branded a snitch. Being branded a snitch is an undesirable label in that, you would be held in very low regard by other prisoners, indeed, you would be at the same level as a punk or a bitch and still more likely to be raped. This is a good example of how an inmate must respond in exactly the right masculine way (i.e. perform or do his gender appropriately), and if they do not, they more than likely will find themselves in an impossible situation. If he does not fight back, he is gay and if he does to no avail, he is a woman.

Reporting Rape

Inmates have several recourses available to them if they have been sexually assaulted. They can report their rape to prison administrators, they can tell a guard they feel as if their life is in danger (without specifying details) which may result in them going into protective custody or they can ask to be transferred to another prison. However, according to the inmates in this study, the reality of these options is quite different.

Reporting Rape is Snitching

A large majority of inmates felt that reporting a rape is snitching. Inmate 5, “Yes, anytime you run to admin for anything it’s snitching.” Another inmate echoed this sentiment, “Yeah, you tell the laws anything, you snitching” (I50). Inmate 216, “Yeah, anytime you cooperate with security in any aspect, that will result in one being locked up or written up, that’s a rat.” Some inmates state that snitching put them at risk, “Reporting isn’t the right thing to do but snitching won’t get you the type of relief you need but will set you up to be a bigger victim” (I252). The main reason snitching puts an inmate at risk for retaliation is because it is seen as engaging in weak behavior or as not handling your business which is seen as feminine and therefore, despicable behavior. Some inmates believe that snitching can lead to fatal results, for example, “[Snitching is] bad enough to be killed behind” (I70). However, there are other options, if an inmate does not want to elaborate on their experience, they have the option to go into protective custody or transfer to another prison.

Transfer/PC Not Safe

Protective custody (PC) is designed to keep the predators away from the prey, but the actuality is very different. According to the research participants, PC is not safe. The first reason is because any inmate can ask for and potentially receive PC. In practical terms, the perpetrator can ask to be taken into PC in order to get close to his victim and presumably victimize or terrorize them repeatedly. One perpetrator clearly affirmed this, “I would get myself locked up and my chances of getting around them are good...I would straight out rape them, I would proceed” (I232). Another inmate shared an experience he had heard about, “Dude just last month checked into PC on purpose to get the guy who told on them, he lie and say he scared of somebody. If a dude know how to get in, he can get in,” (I2) as did Inmate 35, “the guys that claim to be scared go there and they beat people down in the PC. You are not safe there. One inmate exclaimed, “Definitely not, that is where all the real weirdos hang out” (178). Here again, we see an interesting dichotomy that related to masculinity theory and the doing of gender. If a prisoner reports his victimization then he’s a snitch and likely to be targeted for more assaults. If he does not report or do anything about his rape he is probably gay and wanted it. Still, if he seeks protection he will continue to be pursued and targeted. If he does not, he will probably continue to be raped in the general population, in any case, the situation is horrific at best. This also provides a strong illustration of the assertion that the prison environment is a physically predatory one, and that displays of masculinity must be frequent and extreme, or one’s masculinity may be called in to question. In turn, those who are viewed as

deserving will continue to be prey for those who need opportunities to physically and violently assert themselves.

The other potential option for some inmates is to transfer to another prison, but according to the inmates in this research, this option is also problematic. In these inmate's minds, there appear to be two main reasons why transferring to another prison is not a viable solution. Many of the inmates assert that there is a network of written communication between prisoners in different institutions, therefore if an inmate transfers to another prison, his victimization experience is not confidential. Consequently, it is very likely he will be targeted for repeated victimization. Inmate 12 illustrates this issue with his comments, "Somebody may know someone in another prison or block and they just write a letter to them and it happens all over again." Inmate 13 echoed these concerns as well, "Cause there's no where you can go that the person can't find out, a guy that's been locked up a long time knows somebody in every institution in the state, he'll send word that his buddy is on his way." Inmate 2, "Most people from here, it's a revolving door, you can't run." Inmate 60 also affirmed this problem, "The other inmates will send a jacket along with him by somebody going to the same place, they'll get to the unit one way or another," as did Inmate 77,

We know everything, we have open lines of communication. We send notes to each other and call people on the streets and write people on the streets. If this guy's going, he'll go over there with a stack of notes for everyone, it's like mail call. Really if someone's in a position to be raped, it's because they're that type of person, it doesn't matter where you go, you walk into a room. People see it.

The comments of Inmate 77 allude to the other reason inmates do not think transferring is safe. In the minds of some of the participants, the victim has brought on their

victimization because of their lack of masculine behavior. Consequently, since the fault lies within them, no matter where they transfer they will be sexually assaulted because whatever characteristic marked them in the first place will still be a part of them in their new prison environment. Inmate 123 demonstrated this viewpoint with his comments, “If a person’s real feminine looking or are just weak, they’ll just be victims wherever they go.” Inmate 38’s remarks also illustrate these thoughts, “It solves the problem for that institution, but if he’s being pressed for sex here, he’ll be pressed for sex there, you’ll see his weakness and try to exploit him.” Inmate 293 also commented on this issue, “It might solve it for awhile but if you got pressured for it, nine times out of ten it’ll happen again. There’s something you’re doing that will attract that situation to you. If you that type of person, it’ll happen again.” Once again, we see how inmates who are not masculine enough are considered more feminine, and therefore, are suitable for victimization. This also illustrates the consistency with which prisoners rank each other on the hegemonic hierarchy: that no matter where an inmate goes, no matter what prison he is in, his status on the social ladder will be the same, because notions of masculinity are also the same.

Rape Because Need Sex

Sexual aggressors are often seen much more favorably than victims. As they are acting out what is seen as masculine behavior, they are still men and certainly considered manly. Without a doubt, they are behaving as a hegemonic male behaves. One of the central tenets of “real men” is that they must have sex, in other words real men have sexual needs and these needs must be fulfilled. Further, real men use sex to gain conquest, so these needs must be fulfilled as well. Consequently, there appear to be two

main reasons as to why male inmates rape other males in prison and one of those needs is sex. As the prisoners do not have access to women, they feel that they will satiate their needs with feminine men. Therefore, some of the inmates in this study felt that one reason for prison rape is that inmates need sex, therefore they rape to have sexual contact with other prisoners. Inmate 234 gave this answer to the question, “Reasons inmates get raped:”

A lot of guys, I kind of agree with this, they say they have sex with guys in here and say I’m not gay, I’m locked up and need some kind of sexual gratification. I understand what they’re saying. Locked up, can’t have sex with a woman, substitution.

Other inmates also share this viewpoint (I240):

Rape is just one of those things, anytime you have all men in an environment and not have conjugal visits and all that, you’ll have it. Conjugal visits would stop rape overnight. You should consider that, you do it with animals at the zoo why not people, that would do it overnight.

Inmate 8 asserted, “How does rape fit into each group? You have people who been down 20 or 30 years and that’s all they know, their sexuality turned to men because they can’t embrace a woman.” Another inmate thought this as well, “Man got 90 years and ain’t gonna see no pussy no more, a man’s got to fuck something” (I46). Inmate 202 stated, “Because we don’t have no womens here and a mens has needs just like on the street.” Inmate 226, had this to say, “I think it is a sickness of the mind, it is the weakness of being away from female, it is the next best thing.” One inmate (I207) recognized that this line of reasoning is not truly justified:

You can’t meet a female and get together and develop a relationship. You are around a bunch of guys and you may have a guy that has a submissive demeanor. Because of the long duration of time and the deprivation of the female, the lesser, which is the female that is that individual. That individual decides to prey upon

them...We are adaptable creatures. This is just my opinion, that doesn't justify that this happens and takes place.

Some inmates saw rape as a "natural expression" of masculine sexual need and mentioned it directly in their remarks Inmate 216 made this statement:

Natural instinct in man is desire for a woman, but [THIS PRISON] takes things that man had access to away and leads him to just focus on a male and they have turn outs and straight up grown homosexuals. When they in this type of environment since men are cut off all the way from access to a female and the homosexual traits they display, the weak minded men are attracted to these feminine traits.

Inmate 181's comments also illustrate this notion:

Ninety percent of the time it's not because they're gay, it's because of cave man syndrome. A basic need, basic desire, wanting fulfilled, and guys who are less morally structured don't care about stuff like that, or in some cases they are legitimately gay and they will go to a gay person.

Inmate 180's also show this perspective: "Frustration, it is not natural for any one sex to be in prison. It is unnatural to put a guy in prison and expect that something won't happen. There is no conjugal visits and that almost promotes it."

It is clear from this set of comments that these inmates believe that one reason for prison rape is because men must have sex, therefore, as a result of being deprived of this masculine need, some men will rape in order to satisfy this important function. This belief about men's sexuality is pervasive in the larger society and is another good example of how masculinity is often enacted in general society and also in prison. Masculinity theory has consistently asserted that the intersection of violence and sexual predation often results in sexual assault in general society and if one factors in the hyper-masculine environment of the prison, the problem of prison rape is made clearer.

Rapists are Powerful

The second reason prisoners felt that inmates raped other inmates was to gain power over another, or to illustrate their power. A large number of the participants in this research asserted that inmates who rape are seen as more manly because they had complete power over another man:

Just like a man, the male role in prison is clear cut across the board, if you are tough or have power or belong to a gang or are in a certain click they respect you as a man throughout. The lesser sex, the ho has to respect it. They'd just have to say there goes that man and that'd be it, even if he just raped one of the girls. (I11)

Another inmate echoed these thoughts, "They are looked at as the reputation of being rape artists. They are very distinguished in prison" (I232). Inmate 4 remarked, "Predator comes from the straight group can go out and rape, still is considered a tough guy. People respect strength." One more inmate stated, "Strength respects strength, even on a grimy level like that" (I6). Inmate 7 commented on this phenomenon, "Any predator gets respect, whether it's for sex or for extortion, the label of predatory is a good label to have." Inmate 23 asserted, "He is the shit, he is a king, no one looks down upon him, he has a great reputation. Inmate 28 stated this as well, "Viewed as somebody strong, people look up to them, they scared of them. One inmate declared, "Raping will build reputation as a mean motherfucker" (I70). As did another, "Billy bad ass, people know he's a bootie bandit a predator" (I144). Thus, we see that rapists have higher status and rape can be used to acquire a more fearsome and violent presence which is theoretically consistent with the idea that men use violence to gain respect and therefore, to be seen as more manly.

They Rape Because They are Gay

According to some inmates, however, another reason as to why prisoners rape other inmates is not because they are missing women or illustrating their power and control, but because they are gay: Inmate 250 clearly stated this belief, “I don’t think it’s because they miss ‘in a girl it’s because they have homosexual tendencies. I mean imagine, what better place, it’s like taking a kid Toy R’ Us they gonna love it.” Another inmate remarked, “Inmates who rape other inmates are viewed as homosexuals” (I22). The comments of Inmate 397 are also illustrative of this viewpoint, “Rapist is a fag for being with another man, I’ll talk to him but don’t come at me that way.” One inmate (I42) exclaimed:

I’ve seen some of these guys say if they’re fucking them in the ass they’re not taking on the feminine role; therefore they’re not a fag. I’m like wait a minute if you’re screwing a guy in the ass, you’re a fag.

Inmate 109 echoed these beliefs as well, “How can a guy consider himself straight if he’s going to rape another man, no it doesn’t work like that. If you are a straight man you’re not going to mess with a man regardless.” Here we see how sexual orientation and certain sexual acts are considered to be unmasculine or unmanly. This point is discussed in masculinity theory in that the heterosexual couple with the male dominating the relationship is considered to be the standard to which all must be compared or aspire to. Accordingly, the homosexual sex act (whether consenting or otherwise, whether initiated or otherwise) is relegated to a deviant sexual standard which does not fall into the hegemonic masculine paradigm. This contradiction with the other two reasons inmates felt prisoners raped (needing sex and showing control) is also interesting. Clearly, an

inmate who is physically dominant is respected, but there can be a limit if an inmate shows physical dominance by using sex. For some inmates, even the combination of violence and sex which is the epitome of the hegemonic male, can be questioned if the conquest or victim is another man.

They are Hated

This complexity continues with views by still other groups of inmates who do not view prison rapists as masculine or manly but as sick and often describe them in derogatory manners. Inmate 12 affirmed, “Most of the time they’d be hated” as did Inmate 149, “The rapist is some kind of sick something” (I49). One inmate argued, “Homosexual predator not even a real man, just like a nasty animal who should know better” (I398). Several inmates felt an inmate who rapes should be harmed, killed, or at the very least deserved to be treated poorly, “Don’t like predators, our people think they should be taken out and killed, predators are like animals, they are sick and should be killed” (I89). Though this theme is not entirely explained by the theory of masculinities, it is interesting to note that in two of these comments the response for dealing with a predator is violence or murder, which is considered an appropriate masculine response.

Boxing Betty

Another repeated theme that came up was the concept of Boxing Betty, though he was most often called this, he did have other names such as Leaky-Eye Lenny or Big Panties. Boxing Betty (BB) is a mythical character who was most often described as physically large, powerful, and aggressive. Like many myths, he is believed to have

really existed or people claim to have met him in his various incarnations. Most claims surrounding this fictitious individual assert that he has been in prison for well-over three decades, therefore, he is seen as an individual who has survived prison, making him a tough person in the eyes of the other prisoners. His story is often told that he himself was a prison rape victim and once he became stronger, he killed his attackers and then began raping other inmates. Moreover, he either came in as a boxer or became a boxer in prison and this makes him appear even more powerful. He usually attacks people by “knocking them out and then taking it” (I12). This figure came up in repeated interviews because the inmates were asked if they knew of any rape folklore and BB was the most frequent answer given presumably because they had heard of him. Inmate 2’s comments are illuminating:

Boxing Betty was a regular old dude, 4 dudes raped him in the shower at old [OTHER STATE PRISON] before they tore it down so he worked out and started lifting weights and came back 5 years later and raped and beat them up every single one of them, he got his get back, I was 9 when this happened. He’s gay now, but he made them suck his dick; he’s considered a legend, he’s a cool person you would never know.

Followed by the assertions of Inmate 5:

Used to have this one legend that this guy called Boxing Betty, a homo well-known, and he used to box when they had the boxing program, liked taking it both ways and if he seen someone he liked that he wanted sex with he’d beat them up and force them to fuck him in the ass.

Though this prison myth certainly has some aspects of masculinity in it such as: being physically threatening, tough, and violent, he is not a real person and the manufacturing of this archetype cannot be explained by a theory designed to address the behavior of real-life individuals. Though his description and behavior are illuminating in

that, he is a hyper-masculine bogeyman type of figure and myths often tell a great deal about a culture's norms and values. Here we see that the archotyping of a larger than life rapist, who was raped, turned homosexual then came back and dominated those who had violated him (as such responding as a man) incorporates many of the beliefs held by inmates about prison.

In sum, it is clear from the comments made by these inmates that masculinity is a crucial element in how these inmates behave and think. Inmates are tremendously concerned with their outward demeanor and the manliness of it. Further, inmates are fully aware of the penalties for failing to project a masculine image. The theory of masculinities argues that there are behaviors that men must engage in so they can be seen as "real men." If men do not measure up to these standards, they are considered feminine and less worthy of respect, therefore, they are appropriate targets for sexual assault or more crucially, they are at fault for their rapes because they did not act in the appropriate masculine way in order to avoid being victimized. In the hierarchal organizations of prison, these men are blamed for their assaults because they were not manly enough, in other words they must have really wanted it because they are gay, they did not stand up and assert their masculinity, and as a result they were not raped, indeed, it must have been consensual. Thus, not being masculine in this hyper-masculine, predatory environment results in harm, injury, violation, and a complete lack of understanding and compassion.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research clearly indicates that masculinity is an important factor in the phenomenon of prison rape. There are several important findings in this study which relate to the problem of prison rape and the accompanying masculine behaviors inmates must engage in, if they are to survive the prison environment. The overriding theme of avoiding weakness or the appearance of weakness serves as the impetus to engage in other behaviors all in order to avoid being targeted for sexual assault.

The Importance of Using Violence to Retain Masculinity

Many inmates feel that they must use violence or aggression, in order to avoid looking weak or to assert their masculinity. Potential victims must use violence to defend against sexual assault, or if they have already been raped and wish to regain their masculine status, they must retaliate, usually with violence.

Fleischer and Krienert (2006) found that inmates needed to be mentally tough and needed to stand up and “be a man.” Further, they also found that inmates who are mentally weak were seen as being easier to rape than mentally tough inmates, though they never make the connection between the need to be a man, and the need to be mentally tough. They frame these relationships within a theory of prisonization: That once someone enters prison, he must be mentally tough and forsake any signs of weakness. For example, in Fleischer and Krienert’s (2006) research, they assert that the victim who kills his attacker does not regain his masculine status. My interpretation contradicts theirs. I assert that views of masculinity and what it takes to be a “man”

(violence and sexuality) in prison are simply a reflection of what is in society and an adaptation to the hyper-masculine culture of prison life. This is an important extension of masculinity theory in that, masculinity theory plays out in the same way regardless of setting: Men use violence and sex to assert their dominance. In society, their targets are persons lower on the social ladder (females) while in prison their targets are weak or effeminate men. Further, the findings demonstrate that in some cases, engaging in violence to affirm masculinity is one way prison rapists build gender capital. In some cases, these offenders are seen as more masculine, more distinguished, and are held in high regard.

Another theme I found in these data was inmates with characteristics and behaviors that were feminine, signified weakness and this were more often targeted for PR. For example, White inmates are seen as weaker and are thus, more likely to be targeted for PR. However, a large number of inmates also asserted that any “little guy” regardless of race was more likely to be sexually victimized. This finding is also consistent with previous literature (Chonco, 1989; Dumond, 2000; Groth & Birnbaum, 1979; Lockwood, 1980; Wooden & Parker, 1982). Fleischer and Krienert (2006) also found this theme in their research but, again, attributed this phenomenon to prisonization, and not masculinities. Masculinity theory has consistently asserted that a male hierarchy defines the standards of who is more or less masculine and while, in the non-incarcerated population some White males occupy a high-status than men of color, in the prison system, Whites are most often seen as weak. This belief comes from the idea that White men did not grow up in the ghetto or had an easier life before they came to prison,

consequently, they do not understand the tough world of prison. Here again, we see that what defines men on the outside is similar to what defines men on the inside of prison.

Though the inmates only vaguely allude to what more feminine behaviors look like, but, they are quite clear that any inmate who “walks feminine, who shaves their face, who flaunts their butt, or who looks like a woman” is far more likely to be targeted for PR. In addition to looking like a woman, inmates who “act gay or like a homosexual” are also viewed as potential targets for PR. The inmates are often quoted as asserting that inmates who “walk around like they have gay tendencies” or “who display those kind of qualities” often put themselves in the position of being sexually assaulted. These findings are also consistent with previous literature, however, they differ considerably from the findings of Fleischer and Krienert (2006) who found that homosexuals who were publically out were given more respect. As homosexuals are often considered to have much lower-status than other men, my interpretation regarding this theme is much more consistent with previous literature on the status of gay inmates. Moreover, these views on homosexuals are also inline with how gays are seen in general society: they are held in very low regard and are not considered masculine.

One theme that Fleischer and Krienert (2006) identified that I did not find in my analysis of these data is that inmates who were homosexual both in and out of prison were generally held in higher regard than those who were, “gay for the stay (Owen, Wells, Pollack, Muscat, & Torres, 2008, p. 20). In contrast, the findings in my reexamination argue that homosexuals are held in very low regard among inmates, even though many inmates see them as occupying positions of power among staff and

administration in prison. Indeed, many inmates asserted that gays were often targeted for prison rape, for the simple fact that they were seen as more like women, and therefore, acceptable targets for sexual assault by their fellow inmates. The theory of masculinity clearly asserts that gay men (in the non-incarcerated population) are considered to be on the lower-end of masculine spectrum, therefore, this is an example of how attitudes about masculinity are not developed in isolation within the prison, but most likely brought into the prison from the larger outside culture.

This theme also clearly illustrates how real men cannot be raped and how some heterosexual men view gay men and gay men's sexuality. Moreover, it also says a lot about how some men view rape victims in general. It appears from this research that some men think that anyone who is raped must have really wanted it and if they claim otherwise they are lying. As masculinity theory discusses the intersection of violence and male sexual predation of women this theme is supported and supports the theory of masculinity. It also emphasizes my assertion that views in prison are not unique to the prison setting but, are simply reflections of views men hold on the outside. Another undertone of this particular theme is that some inmates must view a male rapist as being a very powerful sexual figure in that, his victims simply could not say no, after all, they all really wanted it. Apparently, some inmates believe that the prison rapist is a very powerful and controlling presence. This speaks volumes as to how some men view other men as compelling and commanding figures.

Fleischer and Krienert (2006) also found that if a man believes he can be raped, he has already been raped, I did not find this theme. Though in my interpretation, many

inmates frequently discussed the necessity of appearing to be strong and avoiding any type of weakness, they did not report anything similar to what these scholars described. Conversely, the theme it appears we all identified was that a man cannot be raped unless he actually “wanted it.” This finding is also supported by earlier research and lends support to the argument that a real man cannot be raped (e.g., Parrot & Bechhofer, 1991; Weeks, 1985). This theme leads into the idea that there are behaviors associated with real men and behaviors associated with men who are viewed as more feminine. And while Fleischer and Krienert argue the distinctions are learned via interactions in prison, I argue that they are reflective of what men learn via the process of socialization in the larger culture which becomes more intense in the hyper-masculine and violent culture of prison.

Depending on how the PR victim reacts, he may no longer be seen by his fellow inmates as a man, indeed, his fellow inmates will view him as a bitch, a punk, or a woman, this theme has been found repeatedly in previous studies (Chonco, 1989; Dumond, 2000; Groth & Birnbaum, 1979). Moreover, should the victim decide not to retaliate, he is at risk for more sexual victimization. In the eyes of his fellow inmates, he has accepted his new subordinated position, and therefore, should he be raped again, he is no longer considered a victim but a willing participant. This idea of men being subordinated through rape, is a clear illustration of how masculinity theory argues that there is a male hierarchy of dominant and subordinated men and how some men clearly are not in the dominant paradigm.

Many PR victims would not have self-identified as gay before their assault, but some apparently take on the role of being their perpetrator’s “wife or companion”

afterwards as a survival strategy. Some inmates change their behavior to appear more feminine. This doing of gender further lends credence to the notion that masculinities are constructed in social interaction and in society and continue to play out in prison, men who become “women” in prison take on characteristics of women outside of prison. Moreover, many inmates reported that some rape victims had been turned gay or decided they liked it, and therefore, stayed gay for the duration of their sentence. Whether or not the victim makes the “decision” to be homosexual, his fellow inmates will definitely see him as such.

With regards as to why men rape, many inmates felt that the reason for PR was because prisoners were not getting enough sex, and consequently, they needed to have sex with someone. This is an excellent example of how male inmates justify needing sex because real men need to have sex with women. Further, some inmates asserted that prison rapists are seen as more masculine because they had complete control over another man. These two concepts clearly illustrate the intersection of sexual predation and violence that masculinities theory discusses (Kimmel, 1994; Messerschmidt, 1993; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997). Further, according to the theory of masculinities, men are supposed to be power, to be in control, and to be dominant over others, thus, this theme supports and is supported by masculinity theory (Brannon, 1976; Connell, 1995). And again, these are views that are similar to ones held outside the prison environment.

Retaliation and Consequences

Many inmates are physically unable to fit into the dominant masculine expectations of prison. According to the inmates in this research, men who are smaller,

men who are White, men who appear to have more feminine characteristics, or men who are perceived to be homosexual are more likely to be targeted for sexual victimization. Obviously one cannot change their skin color, their height, or immediately change their age, consequently, this presents a problem in terms of inmate safety.

Implications

The inmates in this research continually asserted that protective custody and transferring to another prison were not solutions to avoiding prison rape. Yet according to the available literature, these are two of the non-violent choices they have. Obviously, this presents a serious problem in terms of inmate safety. If their prison records and feminine reputation follows them into their new environment and their attackers can get into protective custody, then where exactly are the victims supposed to go to be safe? It would appear from this research that they have no where to go and that is a seriously disturbing issue to consider. It seems obvious that a serious problem exists in the prison system when it appears as if inmates who transfer in order to escape their attacker(s) does not result in a positive outcome for the victim.

It appears from this research and previous ones, that for some the climate in prison is one of constant fear and the near constant threat of violence. Those who are victimized are often young, nonviolent, first-time offenders for whom rehabilitation is a realistic goal (Man & Cronan, 2001). If the victims of prison rape are the less-dangerous inmates, then prison rape is probably seriously undermining the potential reformative impact for these inmates. Obviously, prison is not designed to be a happy place, but giving consideration to the research that suggests inmates who have been sexually

victimized may be more prone to violence, the scope of the issue is no longer relegated to just the prison environment, therefore, making some changes is in order.

Farmer versus Brennan and the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA)

Farmer versus Brennan (Farmer v. Brennan) was a United States Supreme Court case in which Dee Farmer a male to female pre-operative transsexual was incarcerated with the general population after being transferred to Indiana State Penitentiary in Terra Haute. She was repeatedly beaten and raped and as a result, contracted the HIV/AIDS virus. Farmer claimed that the prison administration should have known she was vulnerable to prison rape. Fortunately for her and many other prisoners, the court ruled in her favor. The court asserted that a prison official's deliberate indifference to a substantial risk of serious harm to an inmate violates the cruel and unusual clause of the eighth amendment and that it was the responsibility of prison officials to prevent prisoners from harming each other. Moreover, Justice Blackmun went further, saying that the government was responsible for the conditions inside even if no specific agent of the government had acted in a particularly culpable manner (Cornell University Law School, 2005).

In response to Farmer v. Brennan, Congress passed the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA). PREA mandated developing national standards to prevent and detect incidents of sexual violence in prison, making data on prison rape more available to prison administrators as well as making corrections facilities more accountable for incidents of prison rape (National Institute of Justice Staff, 2006). In addition the Bureau of Justice Statistics was mandated to produce an annual report entitled Sexual Violence

Reported by Correctional authorities. PREA is a significant step forward in terms of standardized definitions and data collection. Over time, it will give all concerned parties critical information that will be used to determine policy objectives surrounding the problem of prison rape. Despite this crucial step forward, PREA does assess causes or contributing factors to the problem of prison rape, consequently, other measures need to be taken in order to improve the lived experiences of inmates. Therefore, it is of major importance that effective measures to prevent and stop prison rape be taken. Moreover, any response to the problem of PR needs to take into account, the issue of masculinities and how they affect and reflect the prison subculture. In addressing the prison rape problem, prevention is a necessary strategy for change (Dumond, 1992).

Nearly all of the previous literature on the prevention focuses on training the prison staff. Consequently, the vast majority of prevention efforts have situated prevention as the responsibility of corrections staff. Conversely, prevention efforts should be inmate-oriented because according to Donaldson (1993) it is the inmates who are tolerating prison rape and who are arguably failing to protect themselves and their fellow inmates. Any prevention efforts should take into account the prison subculture, therefore, inmate-oriented education should discuss the topic of masculinities and their relationship to prison rape.

Normally, new inmate orientation instructs prisoners on the rules and regulations of prison (Wooden & Parker, 1982). Even with the passage of PREA, it appears from the available literature that most inmates are not receiving training on the problem of sexual assault in the nation's prisons (Fleischer & Krienert, 2006). Consequently, if an inmate is

in fear of rape, his only choice may be to ask another inmate. As masculinity is both a guiding force and a result of the inmate code, most inmates are told that they must manage prison sexual violence with violence. In the common parlance of prison, the inmate has two choices “fight or fuck” (Eigenberg, 1989, p. 145). Obviously, this method of handling the problem contributes to the overall problem.

Dumond (1992) asserted that inmate-oriented education and training (IOET) has the potential of empowering inmates so that they may be able to avoid prison rape. It has been argued that IOET fosters discussion and dissemination about sexual violence (Nacci & Kane, 1983). It has also been argued that IOET could discourage inmates learning of the prison subcultures value system and interfere with a prisoner’s endorsement of violence in response to sexual assault (Ives, 2006). In theory, IOET could promote the message that sexual violence is an unacceptable means of demonstrating masculinity or regaining it. Implementing a discussion of the role of masculinities in the problem of prison rape would certainly be an important addition to other preventative measures.

However, it is important to understand that IOET might have some serious limitations in its effectiveness. I believe prison masculinities and the accompanying violence that comes with them are brought in from the larger social culture. Therefore, it seems clear that the inmates in this study are adapting to the prison environment, while simultaneously reproducing masculinity they learned as the result of how they were socialized, before they came to prison. This then presents the horrible dilemma of how any real change take place when they already had the foundation for these ideologies to begin with.

Benefits

As the majority previous research has not used the theory of masculinities to examine the problem of prison rape, this study fills a significant gap in the literature. These findings should serve to illuminate how masculinities may be influencing the prison subculture and the role it plays in the rape of male inmates. Further, this research has some strengths that deserve mention.

One strength of this study is that as qualitative research it provides richer details about the role of masculinities in the issue of male rape in the nation's correctional facilities. A second strength of this research is the sample size of these data. Previous studies have not had such a large and varied sample to gather data from. A third strength of this research is that illuminates us to how the prisoners view themselves and their fellow inmates within the context of masculinities.

Limitations

Fleischer and Krienert (2006) did not interview inmates in protective custody (PC). It is entirely possible, if not probable, that inmates in PC have been the victims of a sexual assault and this would certainly have provided more information for this research. Another limitation from these data is that since the theoretical focus was not on masculinity, the inmates were never directly or explicitly asked which inmate behaviors were considered feminine, homosexual, or weak. However, many of the inmates did indeed describe many behaviors in these terms. Lastly, another limitation to consider is these data were secondary data and as such, the contextual meanings may have meant something slightly different than what I interpreted from the transcripts. However, taken

as a whole, I believe that the contextual meanings about masculinities have been largely preserved.

As this is only one study, more research is needed to investigate the role of masculinities in the problem of male prison rape. Further, more research should be conducted to see if these findings are consistent over time. In addition, interviewing prisoners who are in protective custody or who recently transferred may prove to be informative. For those reasons, my research should serve to direct further inquiry into masculinities and the role they play in prison rape. This subject is important for the simple reason that it is a human right's issue. The feelings of inmate 150 are an especially poignant reminder of why prison rape needs to be prevented, "This is a sad place to come and pay for your mistakes. You're going to pay a much higher penalty than your sentence. Once you get in here, you're re-judged and re-sentenced."

APPENDIX: DEMOGRAPHICS

Age?

Race?

Street Sexual Orientation (Straight, Gay/Lesbian, Bisexual)?

In what city did you grow up?

Currently married?

How long have you been married this time?

How many times have you been married?

Divorced?

Married before this imprisonment or while in prison?

Children?

Where's the baby momma(s)?

Does this institution have conjugal visits?

Current Living Unit?

Months in the living unit?

Inmate Count?

Unit Style?

Number of Inmates in the cell?

PRISON HISTORY

Current Conviction Offense?

Sentence?

How many months have you been in prison on this conviction?

Number of times in prison on separate convictions, except for this one?

Total months in state prison?

Total months in federal prison?

Age first admitted to adult prison?

Age first time admitted to juvie?

Total number of months spent in juvie?

Where were you in juvie?

How many times have you been to the hole?

For what?

MENTAL HEALTH

How would you describe your family history?

When you were coming up, did an adult, relative or friend, or someone you trust abuse you (abuse means to punch, kick, slap, hit with hand or object that causes bruises, contusions, broken bones, or emergency medical treatment)?

Did you have an adolescent or same-sex experience on the street?

Have you ever been treated for mental health issues on the street as a result of something you did in school, or in your family, or in your neighborhood?

Have you ever voluntarily requested mental health treatment in prison?

RAPE

Reasons inmates get raped?

Ways inmates try to prevent being raped?

If an inmate were to be raped, where would it occur?

What time of day is rape most likely?

Ever know a rapist who was killed?

Ever know a rape victim who was killed?

Ever know a rape victim who committed suicide?

Is there one-on-one rape?

Is there group rape? Why?

How do predators choose a rape victim (e.g., age, race)?

What's the reputation of raped inmates?

Does a rape victims' reputation depend on why he was raped?

Do you think a dude is entitled to the sex he has taken?

What is the reputation of a rapist/predator?

If someone is raped, will their friends retaliate?

What happens to someone who is raped and does not lock-up?

What happens to the quality of life in the cell house after someone gets raped?

Are people worried about rape? Is it a big threat?

What are your recommendations to prevent rape?

Do you know for sure of a rape in this institution or any other prison you've been in?

Can you give a general description of what happened without identifying the specific people involved in the event? Was it one-on-one, group, gang-related? Where did it occur? What time of day did it occur?

If you haven't seen a rape firsthand, have you overheard an inmate being raped? What did you hear? When did it occur? Where?

Have you ever seen a rape, like in the movies?

Is there rape folklore-like stories about notorious rapists of long ago?

Is raping an inmate the same as turning out an inmate?

How many different ways can an inmate get turned out/worked/played? For example, an inmate can be involved in gambling and pay debt with sex, or smoke someone's squares and pay it off with sex. Tell me about each different situation you can think of?

What does it mean to be weak-minded?

What does it mean to be strong-minded?

How does money or commissary work in relation to sex?

How does money or commissary work in relation to rape?

What is the best way to avoid getting into the sex scene?

Has an inmate ever been attracted to you? What happened?

How does an inmate who wants sex inside get hooked up?

FREE LISTS

Reasons inmates have sex with other inmates?

In what ways do officers try to prevent inmates from having sex?

Common places inmates have sex in the living unit?

Common places inmates have sex outside of the living unit?

SOCIAL DYNAMICS

What does "Taking someone under your wing" mean?

We've heard that inmates sometimes use terms like the ones we use outside for family members. Do people use these terms in this institution?

What are the basic family dynamics?

What roles do each member play?

Does protection from rape work from within the family?

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE/RELATIONSHIPS (DV)

Do couples in here date like couples on the street?

Are there special terms for these couples?

Ever seen anything in here you'd call DV? Example?

Why would there be DV in a short-term relationship?

Why would there be DV in a long-term relationship?

Is rape more likely in a short or long-term relationship?

LEXICAL

What are the names of the players in the sex scene? Do not give us their personal names.

What do you call the dominant player?

What do you call the passive player?

Terms for an inmate who buys sex?

Terms for an inmate who sells sex?

Terms for an inmate who sells sex for drugs?

Terms for an inmate who sweats someone for sex?

Terms for an inmate who forces someone into sex?

Terms for an inmate who is forced into sex?

Terms for an inmate who was forced into sex the first time, but then continues because they like it?

What types of sex activities are most common?

What types of sex activities are least common?

Terms for calm sex?

Terms for rough sex?

Terms for really rough sex?

Terms for inmates who go both ways?

Terms for inmates who go one way in one relationship and another way in another?

Terms for inmates who are in the closet?

Terms for running a stable?

SOCIAL PROCESS

Which groups have power in prison?

What does it mean to have power in prison?

Group and Sexual Relations:

- A. What are the different gangs, religions, and races in this prison?
- B. Name each group
 - a. Which groups would most likely rape them?
 - b. Which groups would they most likely rape?

How is sex or rape influenced by religion?

Do members of the groups have consensual sex?

What relation are the predators to these groups?

Are there groups whose members are rape victims more than other groups?

Are there all-out homosexuals in each group?

Do homosexuals have power?

Do homosexuals have important jobs?

STAFF

Do you know any cool officers?

Do officers try to prevent rape?

Can homosexuals influence staff to get favors for themselves?

Do inmates ever say they got raped just to play the staff?

Do you know of cases of officers and inmates having sex?

Have you ever known a case where an inmate played a staff members for sex and then had that staff member smuggle in drugs, weapons, Wendy's hamburgers or something like that?

How do other inmates react to officer on inmate sex?

How do other officers react to officer on inmate sex?

Do you know of cases of officers raping inmates?

How does the institution try to protect inmates from rape?

If an inmate is pressed for sex and transfers, does that solve the problem?

If an inmate is pressed for sex and goes to protective custody (PC) are they safe?

What do officers do if someone is being pressed for sex?

Have you known of a case where someone was raped and reported it to an officer?

Is reporting a rape considered snitching?

When you came to prison, did anyone ever tell you what to do if someone was sweating your for sex?

Have you ever heard officers talking about a rape?

INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS

How can inmates who have been raped get help?

Can the system protect you from rape?

Are there rape guidelines posted on bulletin boards?

PERCEPTION OF SOCIAL ROLES

Out of 100 general population inmates:

How many are all-out gay?

How many are straight and not on the down low?

How many men/studs are there?

How many punks/femmes are there?

How many couples would there be?

FINAL QUESTIONS

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Final comments?

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E. (2000). *Code of the street*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Anselin, L., Cohen, J., Cook, D., Gorr, W., & Tita, G. (2000). Spatial analysis of crime. In D. Duffee (Ed.), *Measurement and analysis of crime and justice: Vol. 4. Criminal justice* (pp. 213-262). Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Baller, R., Anselin, L., Messner, S., Deane, G., & Hawkins, D. (2001). Structural covariates of U.S. county homicide rates: Incorporating spatial analysis effects. *Criminology*, 39, 561-588.
- Beck, A., & Harrison, P. (2007). *Sexual victimization reported by state and federal prisons reported by inmates, 2007*. Retrieved January 15, 2008, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/svsfpri07.pdf>
- Bolai, R. (2009). *Timeless*. Retrieved March 27, 2009, from http://thebookmann.blogspot.com/2007_04_01_archive.html
- Brannon, R. (1976). The male sex role: Our culture's blueprint of manhood and what it's done for us lately. In D. David and R. Brannon (Eds.), *The forty-nine percent majority* (pp. 1-45). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Buchwald, E., Fletcher, P., & Roth, M. (2004). *Transforming a rape culture*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2006). *Prison statistics*. Retrieved October 21, 2008, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/html/hivp/2006/hivp06.htm>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007a). *Deaths in custody statistical tables*. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/dcrp/tables/dcst06spt1.htm>

- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007b). *Sexual violence reported by correctional authorities, 2006*. Retrieved March 18, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/svrca06.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2007c). Prisoners in 2007. Retrieved July 3, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p07.pdf>
- Byrne, J., & Hummer, D. (2008). Examining the impact of institutional culture on prison violence and disorder: An evidence-based review. In J. Byrne, D. Hummer, & F. Taxman (Eds.), *The culture of prison violence* (pp. 40-88). Boston: Pearson.
- Byrne, J., & Stowell, J. (2007). Examining the link between institutional and community violence: Toward a new cultural paradigm. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 552-563.
- Calderwood, D. (1987). The male rape victim. *Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 21*(5), 53-54.
- Carroll, L. (1977). Humanitarian reform and biracial sexual assault in a maximum security prison. *Urban Life, 5*, 417-437.
- Catalano, S.M. (2004). *Criminal victimization, 2003*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Chonco, N. (1989). Sexual assaults among male inmates: A descriptive study. *The Prison Journal, 69*(1), 72-82.
- Connell, R.W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cornell University Law School. (2005). *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825 (1994):

Opinion (Souter). Retrieved October 27, 2005, from

<http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/92-7247.ZO.html>

Cowburn, M. (2007). Men researching men in prison: The challenges of profeminist research. *The Howard Journal*, 46(3), 276-288.

Davis, A. (1977). Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sheriff's vans. In C. Bryant (Ed.), *Sexual deviancy in social context* (pp. 269-279). New York: New Viewpoints.

Donaldson, S. (1993). *Overview of the prisoner rape education project*. Brandon, VT: Safer Society Press.

Donaldson, S. (1993, December 29). The rape crisis behind bars. *The New York Times*, p. A11.

Donaldson, S. (2001). A million jockers, punks and queens. In D. Sabo, T. Kupers, & W. London (Eds.), *Prison masculinities* (pp. 118-126). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dumond, R.W. (1992). The sexual assault of male inmates in incarcerated settings. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 20(2), 135-157.

Dumond, R.W. (2000). Inmate sexual assault: The plague that persists. *The Prison Journal*, 80(4), 407-414.

Dumond, R.W., & Dumond, D.A. (2002). The treatment of sexual assault victims. In C. Hensley (Ed.), *Prison sex: Practice and policy* (pp. 67-87). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

- Eigenberg, H. (1989). Male rape: An empirical examination of correctional officer's attitudes toward rape in prison. *The Prison Journal*, 69(1), 39-56.
- Eigenberg, H. (2000). Correctional officers and their perceptions of homosexuality, rape, and prostitution in male prisoners. *Prison Journal*, 80, 415-433.
- Embrick, D., Walther, C., & Wickens, C. (2007). Working class masculinity: Keeping gay men and lesbians out of the workplace. *Sex Roles*, 56(11), 757-766.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2008). *Uniform crime report: Arrests by sex, 2007*. Retrieved May 3, 2009, from http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/data/table_42.html
- Fleisher, M., & J. Krienert. (2006). *The culture of prison sexual violence*. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/216515.pdf>
- Fuller, D., & Orsagh, T. (1977). Violence and victimization within a state prison system. *Criminal Justice Review*, 2(2), 35-55.
- Gilligan, J. (2000). *Violence: Reflections on our deadliest epidemic*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Groth, N., & Birnbaum, H. (1979). *Men who rape: The psychology of the offender*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hansson, D. (1992). *What is rape trauma syndrome?* Retrieved April 19, 2008, from <http://web.uct.ac.za/depts/sjrp/publicat/rape.htm>
- Harlow, C. (2003). *Education and correction populations*. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>
- Hawkins, G. (1982). *The prison: Policy and practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Hensley, C. (2002). *Prison sex: Practice and policy*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Hensley, C., Koscheski, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2005). Examining the characteristics of male sexual assault targets in a southern maximum-security prison. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(6), 667-679.
- Hensley, C., Tewksbury, R., & Castle, T. (2003). Characteristics of prison sexual assault targets in male Oklahoma correctional facilities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(6), 595-606.
- Hinds, P., Vogel, R., & Clarke-Steffen, L. (1997). Pearls, pith, and provocation: The possibilities and pitfalls of doing a secondary analysis of a qualitative data set. *Qualitative Health Research*, 7(3), 408-424.
- Human Rights Watch. (2001). *No escape: Male rape in U.S. prisons*. Retrieved November 10, 2006, from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/prison/report.html>
- Ives, T. (2006). *Inmate-on-inmate rape of adult males in prison*. Retrieved April 22, 2009, from <http://minds.wisconsin.edu/handle/1793/33930>
- James, D., & Glaze, L. (2006). *Mental health problems of prison and jail inmates*. Retrieved April 27, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/mhppji.pdf>
- Jenness, V., Maxon, C., Matsuda, K., & Sumner, J. (2007). *Violence in California correctional facilities: An empirical examination of sexual assault*. Retrieved March 19, 2009, from http://ucicorrections.seweb.uci.edu/pdf/final_prea_report.pdf

- Johnson, A. (1995). *The Blackwell dictionary of Sociology* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Johnson, A. (2005). *The gender knot: Unraveling our patriarchal legacy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Johnson, M. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Katz, J. (1988). *Seductions of crime*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kerbs, J., & Jolley, J. (2007). Inmate-on-inmate victimization among older prisoners. *Crime & Delinquency*, 53(2), 187-218.
- Keys, D. (2002). Instrumental sexual scripting. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 18(3), 258-278.
- Kilmartin, C. (1994). *The masculine self*. New York: Macmillan Publishing.
- Kimmel, M. (1994). Masculinity as homophobia. In E. Disch (Ed.), *Reconstructing gender: A multicultural anthology* (pp. 132-139). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Kimmel, M., & Aronson, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Men and masculinities: A social, cultural, and historical encyclopedia*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Kunselman, J., Tewksbury, R., Dumond, R., & Dumond, D. (2002). Nonconsensual sexual behavior. In C. Hensley (Ed.), *Prison sex: Practice and reality* (pp. 27-48). Boulder, CO: Lynn Rienner Publishers.

- Kupers, T. (2001). Rape and the prison code. In D. Sabo, T. Kupers, & W. London (Eds.), *Prison masculinities* (pp. 111-117). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kupers, T. (2001). Rape and the prison code. In D. Sabo, T. Kupers, & W. London (Eds.), *Prison masculinities* (pp. 111-117). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Levant, R., & Pollack, W. (2003). *A new psychology of men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lippa, R., Martin, L., & Freidman, H. (2000). Gender-related individual differences and mortality in the Terman longitudinal study: Is masculinity hazardous to your health. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26(12), 1560-1570.
- Lipscomb, G., Muram, D., Speck, P., & Mercer, M. (1992). Male victims of sexual assault. *JAMA*, 267(22): 3064–3066.
- Lockwood, D. (1980). *Prison sexual violence*. New York: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Man, C., & Cronan, J. (2001). Forecasting sexual abuse in prison: The prison subculture of masculinity as a backdrop for “deliberate indifference.” *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 92, 127-185.
- Martin P.Y. (1998). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Reflections on Robert Connell's masculinities. *Gender & Society*, 13, 472–474.
- Martin, T. (2003). *Behind prison walls*. Boulder, CO: Paladin Press.
- McCorkle, R. (1992). Personal precautions to violence in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19(2), 160-173.

- McCorkle, R. (2001). Fear of victimization and symptoms of psychopathology among prison inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 19(1/2), 27-41.
- McGuire, D.M. (2005). The impact of prison rape on public health. *Californian Journal of Health Promotion*, 3(2), 72-83.
- McMullen, R. (1990). *Male rape: Breaking the silence on the last taboo*. London: GMP Publishers.
- Messerschmidt, J. (1993). *Masculinities and crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Messerschmidt, J. (2001). Masculinities, crime, and prison. In D. Sabo, T. Kupers, & W. London (Eds.), *Prison masculinities* (pp. 67-72). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mezey, G., & King, M. (2000). *Male victims of sexual assault*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moss, C., Hosford, R., & Anderson, W. (1979). Sexual assault in prison. *Psychological Reports*, 4, 823-828.
- Mullins, C. (2006). *Holding your square: Masculinities, streetlife and violence*. Portland, OR: Willian.
- Mumola, C. (2005). *Suicide and homicide in state prisons and local jails*. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/shsplj.pdf>
- Nacci, P., & Kane, T. (1983). The incidence of sex and sexual aggression in federal prisons. *Federal Probation*, 47(4), 31-36.

- National Institute of Justice Staff. (2006). *NIJ's response to the Prison Rape Elimination Act*. Retrieved April 23, 2009, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/213137.pdf>
- O'Donnell, I. (2004). Prison rape in context. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 241-255.
- Office of Justice Programs. (2007). *Prisoner reentry*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Owen, B., Wells, J., Pollack, J., Muscat, B., & Torres, S. (2008). *Gendered violence and safety: A contextual approach to improving safety in women's prisons*. Retrieved April 25, 2009, from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/225339.pdf>
- Parrot, A., & Bechhofer, L. (1991). *Acquaintance rape: The hidden crime*. New York: Wiley.
- Peckham, A. (2007). *Urban dictionary*. Riverside, NJ: Andrews McMeel Publishing.
- Pinar, W. (2001). *The gender of racial politics and violence in America: Lynching, prison rape, & the crisis of masculinity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pyke, K. (1996). Class-based masculinities: The interdependence of gender, class, and interpersonal power. *Gender & Society*, 10, 527-549.
- Reese, R. (2003). *American paradox: Young black men*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Rios, V. (2009). The consequences of the criminal justice pipeline on black and Latino masculinity. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 623(1), 52-63.

- Sabo, D. (2001). Doing time, doing masculinity: Sports and prison. In D. Sabo, T. Kupers, & W. London (Eds.), *Prison masculinities* (pp. 61-66). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sabo, D., Kupers, T., & London, W. (Eds.). (2001). *Prison masculinities*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sanday, P. (1996). *A woman scorned: Acquaintance rape on trial*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Saum, C., Surratt, H., Inciardi, J., & Bennett, R. (1995). Sexual assault in prisons: Exploring the myths and realities. *The Prison Journal*, 75(4), 413-430.
- Scacco, A. (1975). *Rape in prison*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishing.
- Scacco, A. (1982). *Male rape: A casebook of sexual aggressions*. New York: AMS Press.
- Scarce, M. (1997). *Male on male rape: The hidden toll of stigma and shame*. New York: Plenum Publishing.
- Schrock, D., & Schwalbe, M. (2009). Men, masculinity, and manhood acts. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 35, 277-296.
- Schwartz, M., & DeKeseredy, M. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scully, D. (1995). Rape is the problem. In B.R. Price & N. Sokoloff (Eds.), *The criminal justice system and women: Offenders, victims, and workers* (2nd ed., pp. 197-215). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Smith, N., & Batiuk, M. (1989). Sexual victimization and inmate social interaction. *The Prison Journal*, 69(2), 29-38.

- Stowell, J. & Byrne, J. (2008). Does what happens in prison stay in prison? Examining the reciprocal relationship between community and prison culture. In J. Byrne, D. Hummer, & F. Taxman (Eds.), *The culture of prison violence* (pp. 27-39). Boston: Pearson.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. London: Sage.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., & Struckman-Johnson, D. (2000). Sexual Coercion rates in seven Midwestern prison facilities for men. *The Prison Journal*, 80(4), 379-390.
- Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., Rucker, L., Bumby, K., & Donaldson, S. (1996). Sexual coercion reported by men and women in prison. *Journal of Sex Research*, 33(1), 67-76.
- Sykes, G.M. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sykes, G., & Cullen, F. (1992). *Criminology*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Tewksbury, R. (1989). Fear of sexual assault in prison inmates. *The Prison Journal*, 69(1), 62-71.
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. (2001). Lifestyle factors associated with the sexual assault of men: A routine activity theory analysis. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 9(2), 153-182.
- Toch, H. (1977). *Living in prison: The ecology of survival*. New York: Free Press.

- U.S. House of Representatives. (2000). *Findings from the Stop Rape Elimination Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wallace, H. (2002). *Family violence: Legal, medical, and social perspectives* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Warren, J. (2008). *One in 100: Behind bars in America 2008*. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trust.
- Weeks, J. (1985). *Sexuality and its discontents*. London: Routledge.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society, 1*, 125-151.
- West, H., & Sable, W. (2007). *Prisoners in 2007*. Retrieved May 4, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p07.pdf>
- Whitehead, A. (2005). Man to man violence. *The Howard Journal, 44*(4), 411-422.
- Wolff, N., Blitz, C., Shi, J., Bachman, R., & Siegel, J. (2006). Sexual victimization inside prisons: Rates of victimization. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*(5), 835-842.
- Wolff, N., Shi, J., & Bachman, R. (2008). Measuring victimization inside prisons: Questioning the questions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(10), 1342-1362.
- Wooden, W., & Parker, J. (1982). *Men behind bars: Sexual exploitation in prison*. New York: Plenum Press.